THE SUNDAY SCHOOL QUARTERLY

VOL. II OCTOBER, 1910 No. 3

HEROES OF FAITH

ALBERT THORNHILL, M.A.

WHO is there the wide world over that would not love to be a hero? If there be any such, boy or man, I do not wish to know him; for such a boy or man will have a low ideal of life. All worthy men and women love the heroic; they are what Thomas Carlyle would call hero-worshippers. By this he means that when they see a truly great man or woman, they feel drawn towards them; they wish to follow them, and serve them, and be like them. It is because men and women and young people especially, try to be like great men and heroes, that mankind becomes better. The heroes make history; because they lead others in the right way. If you think about this you will remember many an example of it from the history that you know.

Jesus Christ, the Chief Hero

Perhaps the best example of all is one that nearly everybody knows about. Jesus Christ is really the chief hero of all history; because no man ever lived who made others love him, and wish to be like him so much as Jesus Christ. You could not possibly have a better hero to copy and serve than he. Perhaps you have never thought of him in this way before. Perhaps you have had to learn quite a number of his sayings as tasks at school, and you have never thought of their meaning. Or perhaps you have never read the story of his life right through as a true story. If you will do this, and think about it, you will find how really great Jesus was; how hard it is to do some of the things he wishes you to do. He is great and heroic because he did all these things which others wish they could do, but find so very hard. If you try to forgive your enemies, you will understand what I mean. For, you remember that Jesus told men to do this; and also did it himself under the most trying circumstances. When wicked men whom he had tried to help, nailed him to the cross, he prayed God to forgive them.

Various Kinds of Heroes

True, there are different kinds of heroes, and perhaps your idea of them has been that they risk their lives to save others. It sometimes happens in war that a wounded soldier is saved from bleeding to death by a comrade, who carries him out of danger, while bullets are flying about him. That is a brave act, which kings reward. Or, you read in the papers of miners being rescued from the deadly firedamp, or from fire, or flood, by their mates at the risk of their lives. That, too, is noble; and makes us all feel proud of the valour of our fellowmen. Or you read of doctors who lose their lives by catching deadly diseases from those they are trying to cure. I hope someday we shall see how brave and splendid a thing that is, and that we shall be as proud of noble doctors, and nurses, and mothers, as we are of the miners and the soldiers. Every boy who reads about these great exploits wishes at the time to be as brave and as heroic as those who do them. He, too, is then a hero-worshipper.

Religious Heroes

But there are other kinds of heroes still; and I am the more eager to tell you of them because they are not often spoken of, and yet you and I owe to them a great debt. Sometimes these heroes are called 'martyrs,' which means that they are witnesses. To what do they bear witness and how? They

bear witness at the risk of their lives to God's ways with men. That is why I have called them 'Heroes of Faith.' In days when men taught cruel and terrible things about God these heroes of faith stood forth and bore witness to God's justice and love. This may not at first sight seem a great thing; because, to-day, in England, we can think and speak and worship just as we like, and no one will interfere with us. But it was not always so. Thousands have been put to death, or torture, or imprisonment, in England in days gone by, for thinking, or speaking, or worshipping in ways which others condemned. Even to-day many men are being made to suffer because they deny that the Pope of Rome has the right to dictate what Catholics shall or shall not believe.

Early Christian Heroes

You will have read the story of the crucifixion of Jesus; and the story of the stoning of Stephen; and the story of the beatings, the imprisonments, and the sufferings of Paul. All of them suffered because they bore witness to the love and goodness of God to people who disbelieved them, and chose to think of God in their own narrow way. And if, some day, you read the thrilling accounts of the lives and heroic sufferings of the martyrs of the early church, or the lives of the English martyrs told by Foxe and others, you will see how bitterly men have persecuted one another because of their differences of faith. But you will also learn that we owe our present freedom, and our purer faith to the heroes who were ready to die rather than deny the truth; and you will long to be like Jesus, and Paul, and Stephen, and the other heroes of faith about whom we read, even more earnestly than to be a brave soldier or a fearless miner. Let me tell you of one such English hero of faith.

I. John Wiclif

The England of John Wiclif's time was so different from our own as to be hardly like the same country. To-day every man is free to live where he likes, to believe as he likes, and to pray as he likes. It was not so nearly five hundred years ago, when John Wiclif was born. The labouring man was tied to the soil, and dared not leave the place of his birth; no man dared to think for himself on matters of religion, for England was a Roman Catholic country, and the Pope, through the priests, declared what men must believe, and how they ought to pray. Not only so; the Pope also claimed a large sum of money every year because a weak king of England had in days gone by promised to pay it. Many felt that this was wrong, but few dared say so. The Pope also claimed the right to appoint a great number of the clergy, and, being himself a foreigner, he often sent men to English parishes who could not speak English. So that though the people paid for their religion they were badly ministered to. Then there were a great many begging priests known as friars, who went from place to place, sometimes preaching, sometimes telling strange tales, sometimes hearing men confess their sins and granting them pardons for a fee. It is also right to remember that there were no public schools then as now; so that people grew up not knowing how to read. To make matters worse, the church services were in Latin, which the common people did not understand, and the priests did not explain. The England of those days must have been very sad and poor. There were some good people in it we know, but they were deeply troubled at the condition of things. The poor were neglected and ignorant; the bishops were greedy and covetous; the rich were careless of their duties to the poor, and jealous of the wealth of the Bishops. No wonder that the people were readily defrauded by quack doctors; no wonder they were glad to watch the jugglers and tumblers, and dancing bears that wandered from place to place; or to hear the minstrels sing, or watch the curious pageants and plays got up for their amusement on special occasions. No wonder too that in those dark times crime was common, and that robbers lurked on lonely roads, and outlaws preyed on peaceful citizens. Harsh too were the laws; for men might be hanged for a theft of a few shillings.

Wiclif's Life

Surely the men who swept all these wrongs away and gave us liberty, good laws and a noble faith deserve the name of heroes. Of all these heroes John Wiclif was the first and perhaps the noblest. The

year of his birth is uncertain. We are not even sure of the place, though it was somewhere in the county of York. This is not wonderful when we remember that nobody knew that he would become a hero, and so they did not take care about these details. The same is true of Jesus, The story of his visit to the temple as a boy of twelve is all that we hear about him for the first thirty years of his life. When we first hear of John Wiclif he too like Jesus is learning wisdom. He has gone as a youth to the University of Oxford to be trained for the ministry. He must have worked hard at study, for he became a fellow and then master of his college. Soon he came to be known as the Gospel doctor and as the great enemy of the friars. For these friars had got together great riches although they had vowed that they would remain poor. They were the chief teachers at the university, but instead of teaching the Bible they taught a great many curious doctrines which the people could not understand, and which Wiclif came to think were very harmful. He wanted to see the condition of the people improved, and he saw that the church was hindering rather than helping that improvement. Then the Pope sent a claim for the arrears of the annual payment promised by King John. For thirty years it had been left unpaid, and Wiclif felt that it was wrong for England to pay it. The Duke of Lancaster, the leading nobleman of that time, heard of Wiclif and encouraged him in his attack on the Pope's claims. Then Wiclif objected to the Pope sending foreign priests to English parishes, and was made an ambassador to deal with the Pope's ambassadors on this and other matters. This led John Wiclif to look into the whole question of the Pope's relations to England, and into the condition of religion in the country. And the more he thought about it the more convinced he became that things were seriously wrong. He had been made parish priest at Lutterworth, and there and at Oxford he spoke boldly against the greed and worldliness of the Pope, and bishops and priests. The Pope was told of all he said, and did all he could to silence him.

Wiclif Persecuted

The brave man was summoned before the court of the Bishop of London, but owing to the Duke of Lancaster's interference the proceedings came to nothing. But next year the Pope sent five separate orders to punish Wiclif. This time it seemed that he could not escape. The Vice-Chancellor of Oxford ordered him to keep in the Black Hall; but Wiclif had friends at Court who protected him, and so he was again set free and the Vice-Chancellor punished. After two further trials Wiclif was told that he must not teach his doctrines in school or pulpit. But he went bravely on teaching the truth he knew. What was that truth?

Wiclif's Teaching and Work

He saw that the friars had become corrupted by wealth; and that the bishops and priests were greedy for the richest livings. He felt therefore that great riches corrupted the church, and urged that these riches should be taken away, and the priests supported by the free-will offerings of the people.

Next he saw the false reverence given to the priests by the poor and ignorant, because they believed that the priests had magic power to change bread and wine into the body and blood of Christ. He condemned this as a dangerous superstition.

Wondering why people could believe these strange things, he found that it was because they were unable to read the Bible for themselves; so he set himself to the great work of his life, and with the aid of a faithful friend he translated the whole of the Bible from Latin into English.

Then remembering that many people could not read even their mother tongue, he trained many poor priests to read the Bible to them, and to circulate the plain and simple explanations of its meaning which he wrote.

These noble acts enraged the whole priestly party. They drove him forth from Oxford, and raged for his life. Even his own friends deserted him and bade him be silent. Again the Pope summoned him to Rome. But this time, though he wished to argue the matter with the Pope, he was unable to go, for while conducting service in his church at Lutterworth he was stricken with paralysis, and in 1384 he died. He has been called 'the MORNING STAR OF THE REFORMATION,' because he taught the principles of the Reformation

one hundred and fifty years before Luther. All now acknowledge that John Wiclif was the greatest man of his time, and that the influence of his life and work did much to prepare the way for great reforms in later times. He was a hero, and martyr, because he gave himself to the cause of religious truth, and suffered much for the sake of others.

II. John Colet

If you had lived in the beautiful city of Florence, in Italy, in the year 1496, you would have heard a great deal about a very famous preacher named Savonarola. Very probably you would have gone yourself to the noble Church of San Marco in that city to listen to his soul-stirring sermons ; and if you had watched the faces of the eager multitudes, as they hung upon his words, you would have been impressed by the serious thoughtful face of a young Englishman as he drank in the preacher's message of the great love of God. That Englishman was a young priest named John Colet, the only surviving child of a very large family of sons and daughters born to a rich Lord Mayor of London. What had induced this child of wealth to venture upon this long and trying journey through Europe? For you must remember that in those days there were no railways, or fast steam packets, and a journey from England to Italy had to be made upon horseback over bad roads, amid many perils from robbers and disease. John Colet had undertaken this great journey because he longed to learn all that was known about the Bible, and especially about the New Testament. Unlike the great multitude of the priests of his time, who were ignorant, and led selfish and some even sinful lives, John Colet wished his ministry to be really helpful to the people. Therefore he tried to learn all he could about the life and teaching of Jesus, in order that he might make the poor and ignorant know and love him and his gospel. For in those days little was said in the churches about the words and works of Christ. Instead of this, the people were bewildered by hearing the Bible read in Latin, which they did not understand ; and the multitude of strange doctrines which the priests derived from even the simplest texts puzzled them very greatly. John Wiclif's translation of the Bible was no longer openly read. For nearly a century those who possessed copies of it had been afraid to let it be known that they had them, for fear lest the officers of the law should accuse them of heresy,—that is, of not believing the doctrines taught by the Church. If that charge were proved against them a terrible death by burning might await them.

John Colet and a few others saw all this going on, and their hearts burned with indignation and sorrow. They felt that right living was more important than right doctrine, and they came to believe that if only the people could know for themselves the beauty and love of Christ's life, and the power of his teaching, they would try to be more like him.

The New Learning

Now just about this time there had been a great discovery. Wonderful Greek writings which had been lost for long, long centuries had been discovered, and scholars everywhere, and especially in Italy, were rejoicing greatly over the new birth of learning. John Colet was himself deeply interested in the new movement. Indeed, he had gone to Italy in order that he might share in it to the full. One reason for his zeal was that he hoped to be able to read the words of Jesus in the original Greek in which the New Testament was written ; for at that time men could only read those sayings in a Latin translation. Now, however, Greek copies of the New Testament writings had been found. John Colet studied them, and the more he read them the more brightly burning became his love for the character of Jesus and of his chief apostle, St. Paul. He felt with tenfold power that if others could only know all that he knew, they would feel as he felt. With this feeling strong within him he returned to England in 1496 and went to the great University of Oxford, and although he was so young, and not a professor, he announced his intention of lecturing to all who would come and hear him on the Epistles of St. Paul. At first only a few came, and some of those with no friendly intent ; but by and by it began to be whispered abroad that John Colet's lectures were so inspiring that they ought not to be missed, and then the numbers swelled. His teaching was quite different from anything heard at that time in

Oxford. As taught there, religion seemed a terribly hard and perplexing thing. It was summed up in a book intended for young students, which even great divines disputed about, a book containing over 1,150 pages and 2,300,000 words. John Colet advised those who came to hear him to leave that huge book on one side, and to keep firmly to the Bible and the Apostles Creed. If they would do this, he thought, they would be brought to see ' the wonderful majesty of Christ,' and loyalty to Christ and his teaching would become their ruling passion, and they would long to live Christlike lives. For ten years Colet went on in this noble mission, and the results of that mission were very great as we shall see. They could hardly fail to to be, for Colet was himself loveable, gentle, and kind, as well as courageous and fearless.

Colet's Teaching

What made him love Christ so fervently was the fact that he taught men the love of God. That love Colet believed was changeless. God always loves every human soul. Even when we sin he loves us still. Colet many times dwelt upon this theme. He used to say : ' If God loved us when we were at enmity with him through our wrong-doing, how much more will he love us when we are reconciled, and preserve those whom he loves. . . . Grace is nothing else than the love of God towards men. When we speak of men as drawn, called, justified and glorified by grace, we mean nothing else than that men love God in return for the love he bears to them.' This was just the same kind of teaching as that proclaimed by Savonarola, the great prior of San Marco, at Florence. Those who listened to it could not but be roused and helped and inspired by it. Among those who were thus inspired we know of two who became Colet's companions in a great work—one was a young scholar of Rotterdam, who became the most famous author of his age, named Erasmus ; the other, Sir Thomas More, famous as statesman, reformer, author, and martyr. Another great hero and martyr of the next generation, William Tyndale, who translated the Greek New Testament into English, was at this time a youth at Oxford ; and it is very likely that he heard many of Colet's wonderful lectures on the gospels. I must tell you more about the eventful lives and great work of these men later.

Colet Dean of St. Paul's

After ten years of this valuable teaching Colet was appointed Dean of St. Paul's, London. Here he had a totally different kind of work, but he brought to it all the zeal and devotion that had inspired his work at Oxford. He was able to put into practice his own theories, by preaching to the people in English, and providing for assistants to preach, the pure gospel of Jesus Christ. And as he taught, so he lived. He gave away all his private income in charity, and confined himself to one woollen garment each year. Instead of wearing the gorgeous robes of a dean and doctor, he wore a plain black robe. Among other things which he did at this time was a translation of the Lord's Prayer into English. He wanted the people to enter into the rich reality and grand simplicity of the prayer for forgiveness, for daily bread, and for the coming of God's kingdom. About this time his father died, and Dr. Colet became the owner of a large fortune. He at once began to think how he might best use it ; and decided to build and endow a school where children of all creeds and countries might learn to read and write and be taught good literature, both Latin and Greek, ' especially Christian authors who wrote their wisdom in clean and chaste Latin.' Upon this great object he spent between £40,000 and £50,000. Fittingly enough he placed an image of the child Jesus over the Master's chair, as a reminder that the school was inspired by love to him, and dedicated to him ; and in writing a little grammar for the young people, he said : ' I pray you all, little babes and little children, learn gladly this little treatise and commend it diligently unto your memories.' ' And,' he adds, ' lift up your little white hands for me, which prayeth for you to God.'

In that beautiful spirit this great and good man lived his life. He never travelled without reading the gospels or conversing of Jesus. This was his hourly contemplation, his never failing theme. Having tried to instil this spirit first into those who were to be teachers of the people, and now into the rising generation, he endeavoured from his pulpit at St. Paul's to leaven the minds

of the citizens of London. Great crowds came to hear him. Many became deeply attached to him; though the Bishop of London among others hated him very bitterly. Still Colet went fearlessly on his way.

A Brave Preacher

In 1512 there was a great gathering in the Cathedral of St. Paul of the Archbishops, the leading Bishops, and the clergy of England. Important questions of doctrine were to be discussed, and Dr. Colet was asked to preach the sermon. In doing so he told these dignitaries quite plainly of the duties they left unfulfilled, and the harm done to religion thereby. The Bishop of London and two others charged Colet with heresy, but luckily the Archbishop of Canterbury would not hear of it. What was his heresy? Among other things it was said that he had translated the Lord's Prayer into English, and had urged the people not to worship images. Colet went on undaunted and spoke his message fearless of consequences.

One thing that greatly troubled him and other good men was the warlike spirit of the time. Kings and emperors, yes, even the popes themselves, were always ready to go to war for the most light and selfish reasons. This was against the spirit of Christ, and therefore Colet condemned it. The Bishop of London again complained, this time to the king. But the king was yet young and chivalrous, and told Colet to go on boldly reforming, and by no means to hide his light in those dark times. Next year owing to the war with France, every Englishman between sixteen and sixty years old was told to be ready to answer the call to arms. Knowing of this sad news, on Good Friday, Dean Colet showed in his sermon how hard it was for the true Christian to slay his brother man. Instead of following the example of Cæsar and Alexander, princes should follow the example of Christ their true prince. Learning of this bold utterance the King sent for Colet, and it seemed now that he was in real danger; but after talking in deep seriousness with the Dean the king returned to his courtiers with the remark: 'This man is the doctor for me.'

Colet and Wolsey

Again when the ambitious Wolsey was installed as Cardinal, Dean Colet preached before the new Cardinal and warned him that Jesus had said that he came 'not to be ministered unto, but to minister'; and 'he that exalts himself shall be humbled'; therefore, said the dean to the powerful Cardinal, 'Exact righteousness to rich and poor with mercy and truth.' In those sad and evil times the voice of Colet rang true as a trumpet note for righteousness and justice and piety. He was ever at work for the only master and Lord whom he would recognise, and the trials this brought upon him made him old before his time. Three times in 1518 he was attacked with the sweating sickness. Still he worked on, wishing to establish his school upon sound foundations before he died. No wonder men came to revere his great piety and wisdom, and to love him for his earnest Christian life. One of his last acts was to get a man out of the royal prison who had taken sides against him. To the end he was greatly harassed by the Bishop of London; but he had also many joys. One of the greatest of these joys was the news that at last his friend Erasmus had brought out an edition of the Greek Testament, to serve as a basis for a truer account of the life and teaching of Jesus. He also received many letters from good men blessing him for his work. One of these, which reached him from Germany, spoke the truth when it said: 'There is not a good man of any nation that does not honour you.' Soon the end came, to the great grief of the whole nation. At his death, his friend, Sir Thomas More, described him as 'the most beloved of all his time.' 'For generations,' he said, 'we have not had among us any one man more learned or more holy.' And may we not also say, 'none more heroic in life and character.'

III. Erasmus

Now we are ready to learn the story of Erasmus of Rotterdam, the friend of Colet, and his colleague in a mighty work. Erasmus was early left an orphan, and in addition to this untold loss of parental guidance he suffered the further loss of all his fortune through the treachery of his guardians. At the age of seventeen he entered a monastery; but he soon felt that he could not do his life's work in the seclusion of the monk's cell. He longed to see the world, to know men, to learn all

he could, and to travel from one great seat of learning to another, drinking in the wisdom of the great minds of the past. With this intention he came to Oxford during the time when John Colet was engaged in his great work of making the Bible known to the teachers of the coming generation. He was glad to accept Colet's offer of friendship; for though Erasmus had not yet come to see the value of the New Testament writings, and though he was not yet so intensely serious as Colet, he could not help admiring the good man's earnestness and the beauty and charm of his character. He tells us in his letters that when Colet spoke 'he was like one inspired and raised out of himself.' No wonder, then, that the foreign student was impressed by his new friend. Colet soon saw that Erasmus had great qualities of mind, and that he was an able scholar. He therefore tried to enlist these talents in the great work of restoring what he felt to be the old and true religion of Jesus Christ, a religion which seemed to have been lost in the dry-as-dust discussions of the centuries. He invited Erasmus to stay in England and to do for the Old Testament what he, Colet, was doing for the New. Under Colet's influence Erasmus had come to feel that the explanations then given of the Bible made it more obscure rather than helped people to understand it. Still he felt that he had not sufficient learning to undertake so important a task. His time had not yet come.

Erasmus longs to go to Italy

However, he set himself seriously to the task of preparation. One of the first steps in this work was to go to Italy, as Colet had gone. To do this became the great longing of his life. For this enterprise funds were collected among English friends, but when Erasmus was about to cross the English Channel on his way to France the officers of the English government took possession of the money under a law which forbade the sending of money out of England, and the poor scholar on arriving in France found himself in great poverty. It was about this time that he wrote: 'I long for rest in which to live wholly to God; to weep away the sins of a careless life, and to devote myself to the study of the Holy Scriptures.' Not only had he to battle with poverty. He was often ill and weak. Still he worked on bravely, always keeping in view his great resolution to get to Italy and to study the Holy Scriptures.

Erasmus writes books

To find money for this great object he collected and wrote a large number of proverbs which were printed in book form. He also wrote a book 'to cure a bad husband' by teaching him the true way of piety. In these books, which are full of happy humour, he often refers to the evil customs of the time, and ever tries to teach men that if they would be happy they must first be good, and that the best way to be good is to follow the example of Jesus. Next he resolved to do a much greater work. He knew that the Latin Bible, used in all churches, was wrong in many passages; and so he set himself the great task of putting it right. But the mere mention of such a project brought down upon him a storm of abuse. The priests and monks believed that the Latin version could not be wrong, and they were afraid lest people should lose all faith in the Bible if Erasmus went on with his work. Yet Erasmus went on, because he felt that if men would only read their Bibles with thought, and prayer, they would see how rich were its treasures of truth; whereas if they were taught to believe that everything in it was inspired they would be filled with confusion in trying to reconcile things in it which are contradictory. So Erasmus 'buried himself in Greek literature for three years,' in order that he might thoroughly master it before even daring to attempt the great work of his life. That he was greatly encouraged by Colet hardly needs be said. Coming to England once more he was able to gather funds to pay his expenses to Italy, and on going there was honoured with a degree by the university at Turin. We have now reached the year 1509, by which time Erasmus was ready to begin the great achievement of his life. That was the year in which Henry VIII became King of England; and as Erasmus's English friends, Colet and More, hoped great things from the new King they urged Erasmus to come and reside here. He was glad enough to come, for he loved both Colet and More, and others who had sympathised with his

plans. On the way to England he thought a great deal upon the evils he saw around him. Especially was he distressed at the sale of indulgences to offenders, out of which the Pope was making unholy gain. On reaching England he stayed at the house of More in London, and wrote a book against these and other abuses, pouring upon them much biting scorn.

The Fame of Erasmus

The books by Erasmus were now being sold all over Europe, and he was spoken of as one of the greatest thinkers of his time. In 1511 he was appointed to teach Greek at the University of Cambridge. In that year we find that he had made some progress with his Greek Testament, but it was not until two years more of hard and unremitting labour that he was able to set out to Basle to put his precious work in the printer's hands. About this time he received two letters of great interest. One was from the prior of the convent in which he had lived as a youth, asking him to return. In answering the letter Erasmus said he had never liked convent life, and that great injury had been done to Christian piety by monasteries and religious orders. Men might look in vain for any likeness to Christ in the best of them. This letter shows us how sad must have been the condition of Europe at that time. A great English poet who lived at the time of Wiclif wrote :—

'If gold rust, what shall iron do ?'

By this he meant to ask : If the priest who should be pure sets an evil example, how shall the people do right ? This was the case in Erasmus's time, and it was his great hope, and the hope of Colet, that a fresh study of the life and teaching of Jesus would bring back the careless priests to a purer life, and urge them to set a better example to the people. For himself, Erasmus felt that it was not needful to be a monk in order to be good. 'A man who is really a good man, may live well,' he said, 'in any kind of life.'

The other letter was from a priest named Dorpius, who objected strongly to a single word of the Latin Bible being altered. 'Many will dispute,' he said, 'many will doubt, if they learn that one jot or tittle is false.' Erasmus sent a reply in which he showed how foolish it was to think that the mistakes of men could be in any sense the inspired word of God. For his own part, Erasmus wanted to see men lead better lives. He did not trouble so much about dogmas. All around him he saw men denying Christ by their lives. Of what use was their lip service in such a case ? The best way to bring men to a nobler way of living, he thought, was that they should know for themselves the beauty of holiness as shown in the life of Christ. 'Therefore,' said he, 'I utterly dissent from those who are unwilling that the sacred scriptures should be read by the unlearned, translated into their vulgar tongue. . . . I wish that even the weakest woman should read the Gospels and the epistles of St. Paul, and I wish that these were translated into all languages. I long that the husbandman should sing portions of them as he follows the plough ; that the weaver should hum them to the tune of his shuttle ; and that the traveller should beguile with their stories the tedium of his journey.' Where, indeed, should men go for knowledge of Christ if not to the writings of those nearest to him ?

Bitter Opposition

Still these noble sentiments did not save Erasmus from bitter opposition. Even Cambridge, which he had honoured by teaching Greek there, opposed him. A committee of fault-finders was formed to detect errors in his New Testament. Even the great Luther found fault because Erasmus did not interpret some passages of scripture as he would wish. But Erasmus cared little for all this, because he had the blessing of Colet and the good wishes of other friends. Colet wrote saying that Erasmus's name would live for ever because he had done this wonderful work. Still Erasmus did not forbear from answering his critics with some sharpness in a book called 'The Letters of Obscure Men.' He sent a copy of this book to Colet, who felt that it would have been nobler if Erasmus could have remained silent. 'Oh ! Erasmus,' he wrote, 'there is nothing better for us in this short life than to live holily and purely and to make it our daily care to be purified and enlightened. In my opinion there is no other way to attain this than by an earnest love and imitation of Christ.'

In this judgment Erasmus would quite

agree, for though he had been a little hasty in this matter, he had himself pointed out to a friend that it would be of no use to give the people the simple gospel if the lives of the preachers belied their creeds. His whole aim, like that of Colet, was to live a true life himself, and get others to do the same. He saw, too, that it was not necessary for men to think alike before they could all be good. They could hold whatever opinions they liked, he said, but they must not try to force their opinions upon others.

In this spirit he wrote a book of admonition and advice for Prince Charles, afterwards Emperor, telling him he ought to try throughout his rule to keep in view the public good, and prefer it even to his own life. And so in all his works Erasmus kept before himself and others a noble standard of human conduct; warning in turn priests, and princes, and emperor, and pope that they were servants of Christ and owed allegiance to him and to God. He issued many fresh editions of his New Testament and made many corrections of its text, for it was not possible to be quite certain that any reading was right. We have greatly improved upon that text in recent times, for thousands of Greek and other manuscripts of the New Testament have since been found, many of which prove very helpful. But the spirit of Erasmus was even greater than his work, and that spirit entered into William Tyndale, who, twelve years later, translated the Greek New Testament into English, and made it possible, in England at least, for 'the weaver to hum the words of Jesus to the tune of his shuttle, and for the traveller to beguile with Christ's parables the tedium of his journey.'

(*To be continued.*)

An Old Superintendent cites the following as reasons for *not* teaching, advanced by persons whose help he sought:—

1. Lack of time.
2. Inability to teach.
3. Personal imperfections and the consciousness that a teacher ought to set a good example.
4. Sunday schools are doing more harm than good.

This Old Superintendent adds that No. 4 should *not be allowed* to teach, but should be persuaded to become a scholar, and then there may be hope for him some day.

A COLONIAL SUNDAY SCHOOL

WILFRID HARRIS, M.A.

When first I entered the Adelaide schoolroom it seemed to me that there was a very fair sized class there, consisting of both boys and girls from about six to sixteen years of age. By and by, ere school opened, the numbers were about forty. I had formerly known an infants' class of the same number, and an adult men's class of no less. But if the school was small in numbers, it was very quiet and orderly, and I do not remember to have noticed a single clean collar in it; I have no doubt there were many, but they were not in startling contrast with anything else, and I was no more struck by them in this Colonial school, than I should have been in an English drawing-room. The children were all well dressed, even prettily dressed, and were evidently not dressed up for the occasion at all, but simply the children of members of the congregation, comfortably off, and attending the morning school in connection with their parents' church. I mention this first impression of 'A Colonial School,' lest any reader in England should picture Adelaide as situated in the backwoods, and imagine the children here to be a kind of wild folk, scantily clad in 'possum or kangaroo skins. Nothing of the kind to-day. Fifty years ago, possibly, you might have found some unfortunate family living in a 'dug-out'—a kind of cave—in the river bank, and the children being clothed and fed by an industrious mother as best could be; and being near the river was one advantage, as water could at least be had free, instead of being bought at a cost of several shillings a week, from a man who trundled a cask through the street. But now we have electric cars running, are familiar with the telephone in our houses, and pour gallons of water on our gardens through a hose-pipe, having the best water supply in the country.

We are reasonably civilised; I say 'reasonably,' because most of us can help to wash, cook, or wash-up on occasion; I fancy our growing boys mostly clean our boots and perhaps the knives; and we generally open the front door to one another when calls are being paid; and if a

' maid,' a ' lady's help,' or other assistant in the house-work opens it instead, we are very respectful, and careful not to give any offence through ill manners or discourtesy.

From such homes, then, we come to Sunday school. And if we are all well dressed on Sundays, yet father may sometimes be in a workman's dress, out in the fields during the week, or spotlessly neat in his office in the city, whilst in hot weather, and on a summer's evening, one may expect the most fastidious to be in their shirt sleeves, out in the garden, and some perhaps with less,—a vest, tennis trousers, and shoes.

But that is in the seclusion of home ; Sunday school on such days is attended by teachers in ' crash ' suits, and the more daring have a soft collar. Perhaps all have eventually.

Our children receive a good education either at the Public State schools or at private schools, or one or other of the two rival colleges, and appear with the rival colours of blue and red in their straw hats even on Sunday, having shouted themselves hoarse over the cricket, football, or inter-collegiate tennis match, or the athletic sports on the Saturday.

The Sunday school, though small in numbers, is filled with well educated and intelligent children, some of whom are military cadets going to an occasional rifle practice during the week, and also ' boy-scouts,' tenderfoot, second-class, and so forth.

Many of them come in on bicycles.

One girl rides three miles ; and I have seen a motor-cycle on occasion, but that I think was brought by a teacher, who had four or five miles to return home, and uphill all the way. About eight cycles are usually to be seen propped up against the church during school-hour. One family lives at the seaside, six miles away, and more than a mile from the station. Attendance at both church and school is practically impossible in several cases, since we changed the school-hour from 9-30 in the morning to 3 in the afternoon. This change had to be made after the electric car service was established last year, and the running of morning cars was discontinued. For some months we ran a ' Sunday School Carette,' and at 9 a.m. the more distant scholars started on a wagonette ride of nearly four miles to attend ' Colonial ' Unitarian Sunday school. But that was from one suburb only, and young children from other suburbs could not attend the morning school.

Last July I opened an afternoon school. The morning superintendent and I visited from house to house in the neighbourhood of the Church, with a view to obtaining new scholars, and making the afternoon school serve a missionary purpose, as well as receive those who could not attend in the morning. I do not think we obtained a single scholar by this visiting. A great canvass of the whole city had been made a year previously by the other churches, and so far as we could hear, nearly all the children were already attending some school. Having next to no families of our own in the neighbourhood of the church, and none with young children, we could expect little help from child-friendships. Yet some adults mentioned the school to a family where there were three young folk, and with these and some of our own children we mustered twelve for the opening day, and with about that number of scholars and with four teachers we ran the afternoon school for half a year in addition to the morning school. And five young faces appeared by degrees from two families in which happy heartedness and bright faces were more conspicuous than bright clothes. So we felt we had made a start, although our first three new-comers had been sadly falling off in attendance. With the opening of this year we transferred the morning school to the afternoon hour, and we now have our Sunday school in the afternoon instead of the morning. A few scholars have been lost by this change, but we think it will prove the best in the long run.

We have a main schoolroom and two classrooms, one of which contains a good lending library of girls' and boys' storybooks, and a small teachers' library. Our schoolroom is well furnished with pictures, and with a stage for children's plays, which we usually have once or twice during the winter months, i.e., about July or August. Our winter is chiefly a time of heavy rains and cold winds. We do not have snow in Adelaide, nor ice for skating. But snow sometimes falls on Mount Lofty, twelve miles away, and

daring adventurers have been known to go by train and snowball each other before the sun had melted it at mid-day.

Our hills are very beautiful, and our annual picnic consists of a drive in char-a-bancs to the National Park, a stretch of many miles of woodland, gay with wild flowers, and here and there in the valley are summer-houses, and outdoor fireplaces with a boiler for making tea. We hire one of these for the day, and run races, play cricket or tennis, have prize recitations in the open air, and our boys climb a tree and fix up a swing from its branches for the little ones; and we give a prize for the best collection of wild flowers. Driving home again we have a magnificent view of the plains of Adelaide, and of the sea, or rather the gulf of St. Vincent, with the setting sun sinking in glorious colours beyond. This is in September or October —our Spring.

And about that time we have our Annual School Sermons, and get our own minister as special preacher for the occasion, but we march into the church singing 'Onward Christian soldiers' or 'Angels Holy'; and if we have no neighbouring churches to come and look at our procession,—well, it is a new country, and in future years, who knows, thousands more Unitarian children may be following on behind us. But at present we regard sixteen as about the age when a boy or girl may leave Sunday school. It seems ridiculous for men and women to go to school, and certainly we cannot think of married men and women still continuing to go to school, as they often do in England. Once a month we have had Children's Services in the Church, and a series of Stories of Religion—Early British, Roman, Anglo-Saxon, Scottish, Irish, and Norman stories —showing how Christianity came to be known in England. The discontinuance of the morning school threatens this institution of a monthly morning serivce very seriously. In olden days we used not to go to church, but to go home after school. Now we cannot well get in to church in the morning, there are no tramcars. We are considering what is to be done. Some of our boys are coming to the evening service instead of to the afternoon school. Possibly we shall try the Children's Service in the evening. But then, some children drive in to church with their parents in a trap or a wagonette (we run a Church wagonette, holding twenty—seats booked by quarterly subscription), and these come in the morning only.

It is not customary, even with the saints, to attend church twice here. Two to four or five miles each way may be undertaken once a day, but ministers must not ask too much. Our congregation here represents a good 'mileage,' either on foot or by wheel.

We have a Young People's Guild, meeting weekly most of the year, for literary, debating, social, and religious purposes. Six essays on the history of Unitarianism and the principles for which Unitarians stand were sent in by this society, in response to the offer of a prize.

And amongst them they outlined the story of our faith from Moses to Martineau. If such reading and essay-writing could be repeated year by year with each generation of elder scholars or Guild members, it would surely supply our churches with congregations in the future much better acquainted with the principles of our faith, and would train a number of young folk for the work of a teacher in the school later on. Therefore, though we have had 'the prize Essay' but this once, I venture to commend the idea to the generous friends of our English schools also. A pound or so to be spent in books might prove a first prize of double value, both to stimulate scholars to try for it, and supply the studious winner with a little library to encourage whatever serious taste for reading he may have. A second prize, and some little recognition of every competitor's effort, may give satisfaction all round. Our own three judges arrived at three conclusions, and we divided the honours equally among three essayists of special but different kinds of merit. And as the desire for another essay competition another year has been emphatically expressed by the young folk, I hope this experiment may be repeated.

With greetings from 'A Colonial School' to all our schools in the Old Country and wherever the QUARTERLY is read, I conclude.

EMPLOYMENTS degrading to others are crimes No man has a right to grow rich, employing people in ways which brutalise them.—*Channing*.

MY OLD SUNDAY SCHOOL SCHOLAR WHO GOES NOWHERE[1]

FRANK E. MILLSON

He is an interesting study to me, that scholar, and I have no doubt at all that there are many teachers who have given a good deal of thought and anxiety to the care of scholars of their own who have passed through the classes of the school and then have stopped out of our churches. They represent our failures, and it is a good thing to set ourselves sometimes to work to discover the causes of these failures. To point out some of these causes, it may be, to suggest some remedies, and, what is of more importance, to call out an expression of opinion on the subject, and to provoke the imparting of some of the results of your experiences—which are greater than mine—these are the functions of this paper.

But, before I speak of these things, let me say a few words which may help you to guard against undue discouragement in this matter. There is, I suppose, no doubt at all about the fact of the gap between school and church, into which so many of our scholars disappear. A comparison of the lists of the schools and those of the congregations, shows clearly enough that all the scholars who pass out of the one do not enter the other. It is not the fact, but its relevancy as the test or the only test of the success of our Sunday school work about which I am in doubt. And I get my doubt on this subject from the observation of certain other facts in relation to our schools. I took the other day, from the books of a Sunday school with which I am acquainted, the names of fourteen boys who were admitted into the school forty-five years ago, and I set to work, by inquiry and by my own personal knowledge, to find the kind of lives which had in the case of these fourteen come out of, or after, a connexion with the Sunday school. First: I found that in this set of lads chosen at random, I had got an illustration of the truth of this statement, that a large proportion of our scholars do not join the churches. Of these fourteen, eleven go nowhere, two have found their way into connexion with churches which are not of our kind, and one is an active and valuable member of the church to which his old Sunday school belongs. Eleven go nowhere. 'Haven't been in a place of worship above twice since I left the old school,' was the account given of himself by one of them. It would pretty well describe all the rest, I dare say. And yet, there isn't one of the eleven who isn't a credit, in his way of life and in his character, to the old school. Active, public spirited men, some of them on the boards and managing committees of Mechanics' Institutions, Co-operative Societies, Flour Societies, and Building Societies, looked up to by their neighbours as men who have raised themselves by uprightness and by ability, their lives have been no small benefit to the society of the town in which they live. There is some encouragement for us in the unestimated results of our work to which a fact of this kind points, and, if we can but be sure that our schools have formed good characters and have made the life of the towns in which they are more worthy than it would have been without them, we may take courage to persevere in work which is not without its reward, even though it fails a little in securing the credit which comes with increasing numbers and a larger church roll.

This let me say for our own encouragement. But how much better it would have been if this public spiritedness and intelligence and goodness had been enlisted in the service of the church! We all feel that, and, even if we cannot take blame to ourselves for the failure of our good intentions in the matter of the Sunday school and the church, we all wish to get at the reasons for the failure, and, if we may, to find out some remedies. Some of these, as they have suggested themselves to me anxiously considering this subject, I will now state in as direct a manner and as briefly as may be possible for me. Why do many of our old Sunday scholars go nowhere? First let me put this reason: It has, I believe, more to answer for in this matter under our consideration than any other. There is between our schools and the churches, between the attendance of the youth as a Sunday scholar and his appearance as a member of the congregation, an interval, a sort of gap, wide in

[1] Reprinted from 'The Unitarian Herald,' March 20, 1883.

some cases, narrower in others, in all a gap of some kind or other, and it is into this that the leakage runs and disappears. Let us take the case of our Sunday schools, as we may look at it from the point of view of a scholar who has made his or her way into the first or highest class. It is from the point of view of a scholar that we shall see the case best. Senior has got into the top class. He began at the lowest class, and he has risen up through the school, with a good record, and winning several prizes on his way. He is a power in the school, looked up to by the scholars and treated in a sort of confidential way by his teacher, who asks his advice sometimes and lets him into the secret of the difficulties of the management of the school. If his teacher is a good teacher, he is Senior's helpful friend, all the more a friend, because he admits his scholar to some fellowship in his work. Without intention, just because it is a matter of common experience indeed, the teacher 'lets out' to his scholar that there is between school and congregation a slight feeling of antagonism. The church is the master of the situation. At a pinch the school must yield even in points which concern the teachers, and in which from their experience they are likely to be the better informed body. There grows up in the minds of the elder scholars the notion that the congregation is in antagonism to the school. It is not a notion which favours a transfer of affection from one body to the other.

The time comes when a choice has to be made, and then these little unintentional, half-fancied, half-real grievances tell. The chances are that the Sunday scholar who has outgrown the school and the class has no very favourable opinion of the congregation. Why should he join it? He does not join it. On Anniversary Sunday he goes to the services out of a sort of loyalty to the school, and he gives his shilling, and then his attendance ceases. What remedy can one suggest for this? One seems to be very naturally suggested by the facts of the case. It is that as far as may be, the congregation shall do more than is at present done in some of our congregations to consider the elder classes of the schools as belonging to it. It is that, the space between school and congregation, the interval in which there is room for conjecture and suspicion and dislike to grow, should be filled up by something. Why should there not be some taking into the service of the congregation of a representative, one at least, of the elder scholars of the school? There are many duties which might with advantage be fulfilled by them. Sharing duties they would share counsels, and the bond of a partnership in the common work would be strengthened. I have noticed that when something of this kind has been done, the interest of the scholar in his school has been naturally and unconsciously transferred to his church.

The same kind of natural partnership might very easily be cultivated in the relation of the children of the school to the services of the congregation. What is that relation now? The children are taken to church. They are the only part of the congregation which is not there of its own accord. Sometimes they are not of the congregation at all. They sit in some gallery, or at any rate, by themselves in a body, under guard of watchful teachers.

These are not conditions favourable to love of the church as a place, and oftener than we think love is the root of fidelity. Very often it is the consolation of the scholar that he is growing up to be his own master, and that he will have it in his power to escape from management and compulsion which are distasteful to him. I can speak with some of the confidence of one who has tried an experiment in this matter, which has not been altogether a failure, when I recommend a method of meeting this difficulty. For the younger children some guardianship by their teachers is no doubt needful, for the comfort of the congregation is to be respected; but, provision being made for such guardianship, let the classes take their places at their own choice, here or there, as it suits them (this is possible only in a free and unappropriated church), and in the case of the elder classes, girls and boys, let it be understood, that while the teachers desire their attendance at the services, and take pleasure in seeing them in the congregation, there is no compulsion in that matter. Compulsion fosters opposition; but to be left to decide for themselves, that helps to form a self-regulated habit, and the attendance given of free-will, grows into the habitual attendance which forms its own attachment to the

congregation. I have seen under such a system, boys who used to hide behind doors, sometimes to get out of windows, to escape the hard necessity of appearing in the chapel, come of their own accord, and sit together at the evening services; and from among boys so treated, I have known some of the most willing and loving helpers of a congregation come.

In the service and in the sermon,—each service and each sermon, there should be thought of the children, care taken to provide in each service one hymn which the children know, or a word or two of explanation of the lessons specially addressed to the young, so that no Sunday passes over without their being led to feel that they are thought of as members of the congregation; and that the things that are said are meant for them as well as for their fathers and mothers and the older folks. And not for the children only should care of this kind be taken; but also for the young who are beginning to read and to think, who take an interest in the subjects of the day, and would welcome guidance, which comes with sympathy in their pursuits and their difficulties. It may be the case, sometimes it is, that the children are made objects of care in the preparation for the Sunday services. There is the anecdote for them, or the explanation, or the word of advice for children, but the elder scholars, they are in that barren mid-region, where no manna falls. Yet their interests, surely, being interests quick with the life of activity in every day use are just the very best opportunities for the religious teacher. It is out of opportunities of this kind, which were not used, or which were met with an unwise opposition that a great deal of the dislike for religion of our time comes.

There is, for minister and for Sunday school teacher, an illustration of this, which comes with singular force in the account Mr. Bradlaugh gives of his first separating from religion. He was a Sunday scholar, and he became a Sunday school teacher. His clergyman pressed him to be confirmed, and when he found difficulties, in the catechism and the articles, told him that it was wrong to doubt. Then he took up teetotalism as a hobby, and began to advocate that. His clergyman, strange as it may seem to us now, saw in that one more proof of his atheistic tendencies, and made things difficult for him with his employer, leading even to his leaving home, and his work and the church. Under Bradlaugh's opposition to the religion of to-day there lies a vein of personal anger and soreness of feeling, which may easily be accounted for by the thought that nothing grows so much as opposition or a lack of sympathy with our honest endeavours to do right.

I confess that there is a lesson, not unneeded, for most of us in that story. We need a power of sympathy with the rising hopes, with the plans, the interests of the young, their endeavours after the best, a sympathy like that out of which the influence of Arnold, and of Frederick Robertson, and of Dr. Newman came.

While I am speaking of school and congregation, let me say that most fatal of all is the gap which some of our churches allow to exist between the moral care and interest and guidance given in the school and the teaching from the pulpit in the Church. The school, in many cases, does the work of a church for the young people. It forms their characters, gives them guidance, sets them to work which draws out their powers—stands their friend in all the troubles and difficulties of their lives. That is why they love and speak of it with gratitude and respect. But the time comes when they outgrow it. They pass on into the congregation. There they find what some one called 'good advice in general; nothing in particular'—advice in plenty, little guidance. Sometimes little notice even; then they fall away. The church does not give them what they feel they need. The old complaint used to be, the chapels are 'patronage shops,' and people of independence turned away from work in which they could not find a place and a share. Now, the comment made by people from whom you hear a reason for their falling off is:—It does not help me. That is their version of Paul's 'foolishness of preaching.' Now, let me say that, as a minister, I am not ready to admit that preaching in our chapels is foolish, or that it is not helpful,—helpful of the wish to do right, to become better. Wishing is but one half, and the easier half of the difficult business of a good and wise life. The Sunday scholar has been accustomed to guidance in those other and more difficult things,—self-management, conduct, resist-

ance of temptation, standing in opposition to evil custom and fashionable error. The congregation too often gives maxims, directions,—not guidance, not fellowship, not discipline. When this is all that it gives him, the old Sunday scholar falls away from it,—drops off,—goes nowhere. How can this trouble be wisely met? It is met and provided for well in some of our congregations. What is their method, which we look at with a desire to get at the secret? Is it not this, that in the congregation there is some one, the minister, or some wise kind-hearted layman, who is drawn by his interest in the young to making himself the friend of those who are new comers to our churches? There is no better work that such a one can do. It is needed so much, and it wins such gratitude and love! Where this is done, you find a flourishing congregation,—keeping its young people, and growing in strength and numbers as the years go by. It is by work of this kind that good results have been attained. From some little experience of my own, let me give a hint or two about occasions of life. Part of the loving wisdom of these good people is in their use of occasions. We hardly make enough of the times and seasons for care of the young. It is, I don't doubt, a familiar experience of my ministerial friends, that when a young couple from among the working people come to church to be married, that is probably the last time they come. It is very often the last time. They have been Sunday scholars. The young man would have dropped off from the congregation when he left the school, but there was someone there for whose sake he went, and continued to go till the wedding day came; then he and she both ceased to attend. If has been my trouble sometimes to notice this sort of thing in my own congregation, and I adopted the plan of considering this as a sort of new start—in which there was need for a little more pastoral care than usual—and I am at some pains to make my call in such a case, and to go a good deal out of my way, if necessary, that this new home may not get out of my way. I have often thought how helpful it would be if fellow scholars and old teachers made occasion of these events for a renewal of the old acquaintance and with a wish to secure its continuance in the congregation. This is a hint for teachers, superintendents, and old fellow scholars, for ministers it is not needed, I feel sure.

This suggestion of the desirability of a show of personal interest as one of the occasions of life, leads me naturally to a subject which is beginning to excite some interest among our congregations, the revival of the old system of guilds or associations for protection against evil and for activity in good work. So much has been said, of late, on the subject of the guilds, in Teachers' Notes, and elsewhere, that I do not feel that it is at all desirable for me to enter on any explanation of their aims or of their methods now. I will content myself with saying that the old words 'union is strength' may be found to be a true word of advice in our case, and that if in our congregations we had societies in which friends could meet friends and help each other by fellowship in right endeavour, we might find that in that union is not our strength only, but our safety from the dangers of a too individual regard.

I will end these hints and suggestions by a reference to one other thing which seems to me to be a reason for the falling away of our Sunday scholars from our churches. It is not, I think, one of the chief reasons for their falling away, yet there can be no doubt that it contributes to the general result. I allude to our too little care for the grounding of our young people in the religious truths to which we have attained. I do not mean that we should send our scholars out into the world armed at all points for controversy with their neighbours of other churches. Too often we do that, and that alone, and there is our mistake. If care were taken that no scholar went through our schools uninformed as to what we really believe is religious truth, uninspired by some of the glow of affection which our principles create, we should find that there would be much less of this falling away from our churches than there is. How is it with us in this matter? In how many of our schools do we teach what we stand for—what our religion is? I have heard of one of our ministers, who, full of a desire to look up some of the old scholars, made out a list and went from house to house. At one house the husband, asked if he was not Unitarian, said, 'No, nothing of the

kind.' 'But you used to go to —— Chapel, did you not?' 'Oh, yes—yes; —— Chapel? Oh, of course, we're Unitarians.' There is a good deal of our Unitarianism which is described by that 'of course.'

To substitute something more definite—to teach not the defences and defiances of our religion, but its grounds and reasonableness and helpfulness—to make the story of its history, not in its beginnings and first stages only, but in the freer life and larger helpfulness of its later years familiar memories, in these things may be rooted attachments to our churches which may not easily be destroyed.

With these suggestions—hints rather than arguments—I leave the subject of our Sunday scholar who goes nowhere to your consideration.

Let me say, in conclusion, that the subject of the failure in this respect of the relation of congregation and school is a familiar trouble of all the churches. I read yesterday the report of a Sunday School Union of one of our Yorkshire parishes—a union of Nonconformist churches, including some 28,000 scholars. The number of those who had become members of the churches during the last year was 11 per cent.

Church membership is, of course, a different thing from the joining of a congregation. It is their test, and 11 per cent. only respond to it. They admit their failure.

They have their way of accounting for it—'some new device of Satan' being apparently the most popular, as it is certainly the least open to opposition and reason by argument.

Our 'Satans and their devices,' let me say, are visible and tangible things—commonplace 'ignorances and negligences,'—faults of view and failures of courage and of endeavour. If we learn where we are wrong—get at the causes of this failure which we all deplore—there is among our teachers and in our churches zeal enough and vigour enough to bring about a much-needed reform.

MANY TEACHERS have to overcome a strong disinclination to exert themselves for the good of other people's children, but they succeed; and who can estimate the value of the work they do for the good of the rising generation! Yet humanity testifies day by day to their good works and unstinted labours.

WHAT SHALL WE TEACH THE CHILDREN?

WALTER G. BEECROFT

A GREAT deal is being written and said about unsettling the minds of little children with the newer forms of truth which have come to light recently. It may be well, therefore, to consider what the children shall be taught in the name of Religion.

It is not the purpose of this article to set one sect or denomination over another or declare that there is only one 'ism' to which everybody (including children) should subscribe, but to discuss, with no attempt to dogmatise, the broad lines on which religious teaching should be imparted to the young.

In the first place, I think it will be conceded by most that the Bible must be the foundation of religious instruction to children. We may call in the aid of other works of inspiration and topics of great human interest, but surely the rock basis should be that Divine Library which faithfully traces the leading of God in dark ages. There is to be found in the Bible all that may be required for portraying to the child mind every phase of human life both in its highest and lowest forms. There are stories too of all kinds—stories of adventure, of love, of nature—indeed of everything. The Bible then must be our primer.

Children cannot of course be considered as a whole on this question. A natural division seems to be—the infant (under 7), the young child (between 7 and 12), the adult (between 12 and 16 or 17). And this division is confirmed by the arrangement of Sunday school classes.

Now, what must we teach the infant? Everybody is agreed that the mind of the very young is only able to assimilate that which is transparently simple and clothed in the garb of attractive story. Doctrine and dogma are met with an innocent uncomprehending gaze from the eyes of the listener—those eyes which seem to have Heaven behind them and indicate for us beyond doubt that the child has come from the very Home of God.

Mr. Hamilton Archibald's system is perfect from the point of view of the infant, and every Sunday school superintendent should make the utmost endeavour

to introduce this system into his school. The system has stood the test of practical experiment and has won for itself a permanent place in the Sunday schools of the world. Nay, more, it has come to be recognised as the herald of a new era in Sunday school life.

There is a certain class of devout Christians of the orthodox type who are content that the very young shall be taught just simple stories about flowers and birds, good boys and good girls, and so on, but, as soon as the child is of an age of ordinary understanding, say eight or nine, they feel compelled to present continually in hard uncompromising terms the recognised doctrines of orthodoxy, of salvation, and atonement, and so forth. They consider the young should be early trained to receive 'spiritual food.' No one doubts the sincerity and earnestness of these devout souls, but what really is 'spiritual food'?

It is not, to use Rev. R. J. Campbell's phrase, 'a psychological sweetmeat' comprised of emotional feelings conjured up either by fear or reverence in respect of far-off unearthly things. No, it consists more of an attitude—the attitude in which we approach facts of religious experience. There is a spiritual side of every child's nature, but this cannot be reached by unnatural means. To apply to the child some of the methods which might prove successful with an adult can only end in inculcating a lasting dread and dislike of all religion. Let love for the Bible then be first implanted by the teaching in an attractive, graphic manner of such stories therefrom as are of high moral standing—stories which show the splendour of sacrifice, the joy of friendship, the nobility of love. All teachers know the sudden spellbound interest that a story will create in the arid desert of a 'lesson.' Why not then make it *all* story? A story from the Bible, flavoured with one or two stories from everyday life which illustrate still further and drive home the lesson underlying it, would captivate a class of children without their knowing it. And we desire no more fruitful source for such stories than the life of our Master, Jesus Christ.

If difficulties arise as to the reasons why this or that happened or was said, the answer can be returned that when the children get a little older they will understand. If the inquirers persist, and they be intelligent beyond their years, then the teacher may quietly and reverently explain as far as he is able. This course is adopted by parents when children become too inquisitive about matters beyond their ken, and there is no reason why the same attitude should not be adopted in matters religious.

When, however, the time arrives that the child will no longer be silenced, and his heart is sufficiently attuned to his mind to desire knowledge for advancement in the spiritual life, then, I take it, the religious instructor is at liberty to state the true position—gradually and reverently—the position as to the historicity of the Bible, the lack of foundation for many of the prevalent doctrines, and the like. But, concurrently with such unfolding, must be given a newer and wider vision. We can speak with unshakeable assurance of the goodness of God, of his fatherly care for each and all, and of his care for our love of our neighbour.

In conclusion, let me say that it is far better for children not to have so much faith to begin with than to have a cargo of faith stowed on board which they may find on reaching years of maturity must be jettisoned, and the barque left in consequence too light to withstand the buffetings of the angry sea. Such craft soon find themselves in the shoreless sea of Agnosticism or in the stagnant shallows of Rationalism. Surely we love our children too much to consent that they shall build their 'most holy faith' on a subterfuge! We cannot base our religious teaching on anything less than the Truth!

Let us so train the young mind that, when it arrives at the crossways—as every right mind assuredly does—there to engage in a mental conflict to determine the road that shall be taken, every opportunity shall have been afforded to ensure a right choosing. Let there be no hampering with humanly preconceived notions, but a clear vision afforded to read the sign posts aright.

We must answer for our actions; God will answer for our powers.

There is a necessary limit to our achievement, but none to our attempt.

We should be surprised, not at our good deeds, but our bad ones. —*Phillips Brooks.*

THE PROBLEM OF THE GOLDEN RULE

RAMSDEN BALMFORTH

EVERYONE who has thought much about the matter knows that the Golden Rule, the essence of practical religion, is the most difficult rule in the whole code of ethics to put into daily practice. It really means, of course,—Do unto others as you would that they should do unto you, *were you in their place.* This putting of ourselves in each other's places is one of the most difficult things in the world. It requires sympathetic and spiritual imagination of a very fine and high order. To make allowance for all the influences of heredity, of environment, of education and up-bringing, or to estimate these in their varying degrees of strength and influence is really impossible. What we have to do is to try to make an approximate estimate with the best thought and knowledge that we have, and then, in the light of that, to judge and act. But inasmuch as we are often called upon to judge and act without much time for thinking, it is well that we should incessantly cultivate this quality of sympathetic spiritual imagination. When George Bernard Shaw says that 'the Golden Rule is that there is no Golden Rule,' sympathetic readers of Shaw know what he is driving at, but I fancy he would have put *his* Golden Rule in a less paradoxical form if he had lived in South Africa for any length of time. Let me give two or three illustrations of what I mean.

The first incident is one which occurred in connection with the household of a well-known missionary in Natal, a man of wide experience, who knows the natives well, and whose advice and counsel have more than once been sought by the Government. This missionary had taken into his house, as servant or house-boy, a Zulu boy of some thirteen years of age. The wife of the missionary had occasion to send a note by this boy to a friend in another part of the town in which they live. The boy took the note, but unfortunately went to the wrong house. He got to the house next door to the one to which he should have gone. As luck would have it, this house was locked up, the occupier having gone away for a holiday. They had left word with the policeman on that particular beat to keep an eye on the house. The policeman did so, and, seeing the Zulu boy trying to gain admittance, he marched the lad off to jail. This is hardly believable, but the reader must bear in mind the difficulties attending explanations when neither party knows the other's language. The boy was brought before the magistrate who, of course, ought to have communicated with the boy's employers. Instead of this, after hearing the policeman's evidence, he ordered the lad to be punished with a birch rod—how many strokes I do not know. Meanwhile, the missionary had been communicated with by telegraph. He came back as quickly as he could, but reached home only in time to find the skin on the boy's back sore and broken by the birch. How easily would the exercise of the faculty of spiritual imagination, of putting one's self in the other's place, have prevented this flagrant act of injustice!

The second case is that of a highly educated Hindoo such as one might meet at Oxford or Cambridge. He was travelling by coach in an outlying district of the Transvaal, on the box seat. At one of the stages a farmer wished to take a seat on the coach. Finding the box seat occupied by the 'coloured' man (Hindoo) the farmer ordered him to get down so that he himself could occupy the seat. The Hindoo refused. The farmer, much the more powerful man, got up, pulled the Hindoo—none too gently—down into the road, and calmly took possession of the seat. Here again, how necessary the gift of spiritual imagination and the spirit of the Golden Rule!

The third case I take from an address delivered by the Rev. Charles Phillips before the Native Affairs Association. 'Recently the funeral of a white man took place (in Johannesburg). His wife and children were coloured, and as he was much respected, a number of respectable coloured friends followed the body. When it was discovered at the gate, the caretaker resisted their admission by force, and threatened anyone who attempted entrance. Even the hallowed precincts of the dead, and the sobs of a broken-hearted widow, are not sacred in presence of colour prejudice.' Again, I say, how necessary is the gift of sympathetic spiritual imagination even in high official quarters.

The fourth case illustrates the great moral difficulties surrounding the subject for the average citizen and the professional and business man. A friend of mine has (along with a partner) a considerable practice as a dentist in one of the large towns of South Africa. It is the custom in this dentistry, as in many others, to take only white patients, on account of the strong colour prejudice which exists amongst the white citizens. One day an educated negro missionary came to the dentistry, bringing his wife, who wished to have her teeth attended to. My friend, immediately grasping the situation, ushered the two, not into the general waiting room where other white patients were seated, but into a side room, where he attended to the lady,—though against the custom of the firm. Two or three visits being necessary, the same plan was adopted on the second occasion. But the missionary discovered that his wife was being treated differently from other people, so on the third occasion he, followed by his wife, pushed his way into the general waiting-room where the white patients were sitting awaiting their turn. My friend felt that there was no other way but to have the matter out. He called the missionary out of the room, apologised for his seeming discourtesy, and explained that it was the custom of the firm not to take coloured patients; that he had himself attended to the lady in order to avoid any appearance of rudeness; that he would continue to do so; but that, unfortunately, he could not allow them in the general waiting room. He had his partner to consider, and also his wife and family. Their business would be ruined were it generally known that they took coloured patients. The missionary, on the other hand, indignantly protested against any discrimination. He laid down the Christian principle in the matter. His wife was as respectable, cleanly, and well-educated as the average South African citizen. God was no respecter of persons or colours—neither should Christian men be. My friend had to admit that in the matter of principle the missionary was right—yet he could not recede from his position, or violate the rule of the firm, except in so far as it was done privately in order to save the feelings of the lady,—and the missionary left in high dudgeon.

What should my friend have done? Had he been a Tolstoi the position would have been simple to him. But, though a man far above the average in considerateness and true and deep Christian feeling, he is not a Tolstoi. He felt that circumstances were too strong for him, and that he must place expediency before Christian principle. I leave the problem with the reader.

This problem of the application of the Golden Rule is, indeed, a problem for all of us. It is quite impossible, of course, to put ourselves, even in imagination, absolutely in the place of others. We cannot, as I have already said, estimate precisely, in any given case, the various influences of heredity, environment, up-bringing, and education. All we can do is to form, on the facts available, a rough standard of judgment, and then try to approximate our conduct to the ideal which that judgment, in conjunction with the Golden Rule, requires. This applies not only to questions of colour and to conduct generally, but also to such problems as the payment of labour. If I should not like to sweep my own chimney, say even for the sum of one pound, should I, trying to put myself in the place of my chimney-sweep, pay him at least one pound for the job? Many other considerations enter into the matter, of course—perhaps I cannot afford to pay him one pound even if I would do so—and so on. But I think I have said enough to show to teachers and to the readers of the SUNDAY SCHOOL QUARTERLY that the cultivation of spiritual imagination and the habit of putting ourselves in others' places is an essential part of ethical and religious teaching and training.

PAID TEACHERS.—The suggestion is often made that Sunday school teachers should be paid. That was the plan of Robert Raikes, and in 1785 an association was formed for establishing Sunday schools and helping them with books and money. The Methodists introduced the idea of doing the teaching themselves, and schools of the kind familiar to us began to be formed. 'It should be remembered the ministers of the Old Dissent had classes, held in the vestries, for the religious education of the young people of their congregations.' The new schools were for poor children whose parents belonged to no congregation.

A CATECHISM

GEO. CROSWELL CRESSEY, D.D.

This catechism is designed for children from six to twelve years of age, to be used according to the age and intelligence of the pupils. The questions and answers form often the centre of a topic which may be amplified and illustrated.

Experience and the new psychology alike show the advantage of giving the child something brief and positive, which may be memorised, and thus form a centre of thought and feeling as these develop.

We need this especially in our liberal faith, which is too often presented in a vague and negative manner. While it is unfortunately necessary sometimes to refer to theological errors which are still current, it is highly desirable that this be secondary and incidental, and that the children of our congregations and Sunday schools be instructed, first of all, in our Unitarian or Liberal Christian affirmations.

In a few cases where the answer is obvious or directly implied in what immediately precedes, the answer is not given.

Some of the questions may, of course, be omitted in the youngest classes while, on the other hand, in the older ones additional matter of a kindred nature may be profitably introduced.

Part I.

Who made us? God.

Who made the world? God.

Did God make or create everything?

Can we see God? No.

Why not? Because God is Spirit.

Is there a spirit in every man? Yes.

Can we see it? No.

What is it? It is that which thinks, feels, loves; it is the real man, woman, or child.

Does God have a body? Not as a man has one.

Is there anything which we may call the body of God? Yes, Nature; everything we see, the trees, the mountains, the whole world, the sun and the stars.

What do we call all these together? We call them Nature and the Universe.

What does the poet Pope say?

'All are but parts of one stupendous whole,
Whose body nature is, and God the soul.'

Is God, then, only in what he has made? No, he is far more and greater than all he has made, and all we can ever know.

Does God care for us? Yes, he cares for us more than a father or mother cares for their children.

By what name do we call God? We call him our Father.

Where is God? He is everywhere.

Ought we to love God? Yes, for he is good to us.

How can we love him? We can be thankful to him for all he does for us, and try to do as he wishes us to do.

What does he wish little children to do? To be good, kind, affectionate, and to obey their parents and teachers.

Will God know if we do this? Yes, he knows all things, and he will bless us.

Did God make or create the world in a day or a week? No, many thousands of years passed from the beginning till the world became as we now see it.

Why did he not make it at once? It was God's way, he knew it would be best.

How does it happen that in the first chapter of Genesis the making or creation of the world is said to have taken place in seven days? Those who wrote the book were very good men—and very wise, too, for their time—but they did not know science. They were inspired with the great truth that God made the world, but they expressed it in their own way, and they could not think of the world except as made at once just as they saw it.

Why did God make man? So that he might enjoy the world, live, and be happy.

Are all men happy? No, many make mistakes and do wrong, and they are unhappy; but if we obey God, we shall be happy.

How should we feel about God? We should remember he is always with us and near us, and will help us, if we try to be good children and to grow up to be noble men and women.

What is the chief end or duty of man? To praise God by being good ourselves, by doing good to others, and by enjoying this beautiful world which he has made.

How may we best enjoy the world? By making it better, and helping others to enjoy it.

Part II

Why do we call ourselves Christians? Because we try to follow Jesus, who was called Christ.

Who was Jesus? He was the best man and the greatest religious teacher who ever lived.

Where was he born? In Palestine, probably in a town called Nazareth.

Where is Palestine?

Who were his parents? Joseph and Mary.

To what nation did he belong? He was a Jew, a descendant of David.

What did he do? He went about all his life doing good.

What did he teach? He taught us that God is our Father, that God is love, and that we should love one another.

What is the golden rule?

Was Jesus the first to teach this? No; other great teachers in other nations had taught it, though less clearly and fully.

Does this fact make Jesus less a great teacher? No, it only shows that many men have been inspired of God, and that God is with all men.

Did some think that Jesus was more than a man? Yes.

Why? Because in those days anyone who did something remarkable was thought to be supernatural.

What is meant by 'supernatural'? Having powers or gifts *in a different way* from other men and from some source above the earth.

Are we not, then, helped from above? Yes, God helps us and gives us strength, but he gives it in the same way to every one.

Do we think of Jesus as a supernatural being? No.

Why? Because we know that God works everywhere in the world and with all men according to the same laws.

Was any man ever supernatural? No.

What is a man or a human being? A soul made after the image of God, with power to think, to love, and to act.

Was Jesus divine? Yes, because he sought to think, to love, and to act always for the glory of God and for the good of man.

Are all men divine? They may be if they will do as Jesus did and try to live as those made after God's image.

Can we do this? Yes, with God's help.

What may we say then? All men are truly divine, made after the divine image, and Jesus was the most divine man.

What do we often call Jesus? The Son of God, because he loved God and obeyed him as his Father in heaven.

Are we also sons and daughters of God? Yes, if we try to live as Jesus lived.

Did Jesus die like other men? He was put to death by enemies who did not understand his teaching. He was crucified.

What may we call his death? A sacrifice of his life for the sake of truth, and that the world might be better.

How do we feel toward Jesus when we read of his sufferings and death? We feel great reverence and love for him, and that we also must do our part to make the world better.

(To be continued.)

ON THE MOORS

W. LAWRENCE SCHROEDER, M.A.

For days the weather had been cloudy and damp. The south-west winds came to us laden with moist messages from the far-away sea, and we began to wonder whether the summer had gone, for there was a clammy chillness in the air which savoured of autumn, and drove us to the comfort of fires. Tempted, however, by one fair morning, we set out for a ten miles tramp over the moors. The sky was gloomy, but now and then faint patches of blue appeared, and sometimes the sun asserted his regal authority and flooded the earth and our hearts with sweet glad light. The valley along which we made our way to the moorland above would then smile in a solemn, almost sad way, as if to remind us that the joys of earth were but for a day, and that the time would come when the trees, stripped of their foliage, would shriek and shiver in the cold blasts of winter. Already on the ground were the signs of a changed existence, for the leaves lay here and there in little mournful heaps, or moved fitfully before the wind, rustling out their message that the end of all things cometh. Towards midday the clouds lost their individuality, and the sun disappeared. We walked along in silence and wondered when the rain would come. It caught us on the edge of the moors, and for hours we squelched our way over the wet shining peat and rain-drenched grass. At times we stopped and listened to the eerie moor-

land noises. Once it seemed as though all sound had been merged in eternal silence. Around us moved soft indeterminate masses of cloud. Thoughts of the infinite love of God took hold of us, and we stretched forth hands of faith through the mist and the gloom and it was as though we were surrounded by hosts of the shining ones, by those who in long-past years loved waste solitary places and the wildness of the west wind, and found God on the uplands in the heart of many a moorland mist. The grass bent to the wind and the rain, and we moved slowly and silently on : but the gladness of God was in our hearts, for we had worshipped at the inner shrine, and the vision of holiness and beauty had not been denied.

Later in the week, the weather changed, and we made our way to moors thick with pink and purple heather. The sky was flecked with cloud, and the air was bright and clear and invigorating. The day was a challenge to good temper and strenuous endeavour, and we clambered through the woods to the moors above in great good humour, and forgot for a time the care of a pastorate and the thought of. lectures and the worry of rates and taxes. We kicked our way through the heather-blossom and felt like children released from school. It was good to be alive, and to realise the freedom of the heights and to hear the call of the birds. As the sun rose in the sky, our pace slackened and our minds were gradually subdued to thoughts of the Divine revelation vouchsafed in the myriad life of Nature. We threw ourselves down in the heather and sniffed greedily the perfume of the blossom and the chastening odours of the peaty earth. It was good. We half-closed our eyes and looked across to the horizon. It seemed as if just beyond the moor lay the sea laughing in the sunshine and ever and anon whispering love-messages to the soft fleecy clouds above. We knew that the sea was miles away, but that didn't matter. For us, it was there just below that bright belt of yellowing grass, and its voice came to us on the breeze and spoke of the things of love and gladness. And then as our abandonment to the gracious influences of earth and wind and sky became more complete, the air seemed to throb with spiritual life, and the sense of personality was merged in a wide consciousness of the greatness and variety of life, and for a time God and the blessed angels filled the universe, and we were as nothing. By slow degrees the world and its cares re-established dominion over our thoughts, but imagination and soul disputed the claim. We saw the fairies hiding mid the heather, or marshalling their hosts in the sunshine and shaking their grassy spears in defiance of a dry rationality which would banish them from the universe. We heard the echoes of a strange subtle music which the wind had caught from the caves of ocean and in its passage over lonely mountain places and desolate far-stretching plains. Then, with a start we sat up and looked with clear eye upon the beauty of the scene. For into the music had crept other strains, and we heard the cry of children, and the shrieks of drunken women and the oaths and curses of besotted men, and the noise and discord of the town. Beyond the range of hills on the other side of the valley were mills and factories and close-built streets, and the work of life lay there, and part of the problem of happiness was to make men and women and children realise that God could be known in sunset and flower, in the play of the wind and the streaming of the waters, in the gladness of spring-tide revival, and in the solemn beauty of autumnal decay. For the men and women whose course of life had been set, whose minds were absorbed by habitual cares and duties, little was possible ; but for the children whose hearts were open to the spiritual influence of Nature, much might be done to bring them into a deeper consciousness of the holiness of beauty and the pervasiveness of God. We wondered how far Nature poetry could be used to freshen the imagination and bring the child to a sense of the spirituality of the universe. In Wordsworth and Shelley and Tennyson there was material to capture the heart and prepare the soul for the influx of divine grace. For poetry provided the symbolism by which our souls realised a mode of divine revelation. We thought of ordinary methods of Sunday school teaching, of the limited information imparted, of the unreality of many of the lessons, of the close stuffy rooms in which much of the work must be done, and involuntarily we sighed. Why could we not bring our scholars to the moors and speak

to them there, of the love of God and the beauty of creation, and the destiny of man! Could we not make them feel that the very happiness of their contact with nature was God's delight in them! The idea aroused us to activity, and we rose and walked quickly on. The feel of the heather under our feet gave us joy, and banished illegitimate worry. The music in our souls was not devoid of minor strains and discordant clashes, but now it sounded rich and triumphant, and the discords seemed but the preparations for deep stirring harmonies. The moors gave us strength and chastened our thought of the divine possibility of life; and we prayed that the children would grow in the knowledge and love of Nature, and of the Holy Spirit by which Nature comes to be. At last we came to the edge of the moor. Below in the valley were men, busy with the crops. Stretching far into the blue-grey distance were ranges of hills. We stood on a rock and let the breeze play about us. It seemed easy to think of Jesus and the splendour of his trust in God. But at the thought, the insufficiency of our response to the call of the Spirit came home to us, and we were humbled. In lonely high places, Jesus poured out his supplications before God, and angels came and ministered unto him. Had not the angels been about us! Had we not caught glimpses of their brightness and heard the rustle of their robes! God was good, and the moorland was his dwelling-place, where the children might one day see the vision of holiness and beauty and be glad. For the earth shall be full of the Knowledge of the Lord, as the waters cover the sea.

A SHORT INTRODUCTION TO THE GOSPELS.—II.

J. H. WEATHERALL, M.A.

9.—The Difference between the Synoptics

The resemblances between the Synoptics, of which some examples were given in the last section, are so close that we might easily jump to the conclusion that the three gospel-writers took their material from some common original; or that the first of them was copiously used by the later two. But side by side with the resemblances, there are some very perplexing differences which must be taken into account before any such conclusion is drawn.

1. *Discourse-Material.* One obvious difference is that Mark contains very little discourse-material, compared with Matthew and Luke. There is the apocalyptic discourse in chapter 13; but, for the rest, Mark gives us only parables and little sayings in connection with miracles or incidents in the ministry of Jesus. On the other hand, the discourse-material in Matthew and Luke is copious, and much of it is very similar. But it is not given always by both in the same connections, or in the same order. For example: (*a*) When Matthew describes the Temptation, the three stages of it are (1) Jesus to make bread of the stones; (2) to cast himself from the Temple; (3) to worship the Tempter. In Luke the same details are given, but the order is (1), (3), (2). (*b*) The large block of sayings in Matthew 5–7 is mostly found in Luke, but broken up, and referred to other points of time. In Matthew the discourse is delivered upon the mountain; while Luke, who mentions the mountain in 6^{12}, says he came down thence, and stood and spoke on 'a level place,' 6^{17}. The commentators try to reconcile the difference by saying that there are level places on mountains; but the variation seems too pointed for that explanation, and the natural sense is that Luke gives us a Discourse on the Plain, and Matthew a Discourse on the Mountain. Nevertheless the contents of the discourses are manifestly related. Matthew's Beatitudes are represented in Luke by a series of Four Beatitudes and Four Maledictions. In Matthew the Beatitudes refer to conditions of the heart. The parallel Beatitudes in Luke refer to bodily conditions. Compare:—

Matt. 5^3.	Luke 6^{20}.
Blessed are the poor in spirit; for theirs is the kingdom of heaven.	Blessed are ye poor; for yours is the kingdom of God.
Matt. 5^6.	Luke 6^{21}.
Blessed are they that hunger and thirst after righteousness; for they shall be filled.	Blessed are ye that hunger now; for ye shall be filled.
Matt. 5^4.	Luke 6^{21}.
Blessed are they that mourn; for they shall be comforted.	Blessed are ye that weep now, for ye shall laugh.

(*c*) Observe, again, the differences in the

words attributed to Jesus at the Last Supper,—an occasion which came to be regarded in church tradition and doctrine as of supreme significance :—

Matt. 26^{26-29}.	Luke $22^{19-20, 17}$.
Jesus took bread . . . and said, Take, eat ; this is my body. And he took the cup, . . . saying, Drink ye all of it, for this is my blood of the covenant, which is shed for many unto the remission of sins. But I say unto you, I will not drink henceforth of this fruit of the vine until that day when I drink it new with you in my Father's kingdom.	took bread, saying, This is my body which is given for you ; this do in remembrance of me. And the cup . . . saying, this cup is the new covenant in my blood, even that which is poured out for you. I say unto you I will not drink from henceforth of the fruit of the vine until the kingdom of God shall come.

2. *Narrative-Material.* Differences as striking are to be found also in the narratives. (*a*) The birth-stories in Matthew and Luke are diverse. Matthew alone tells us of the star in the East, the journey of the Magi, the hostility of Herod and the flight into Egypt. Luke alone tells us of the appearance of the Angels to the shepherds, and the census which occasioned the visit of the parents to Bethlehem. In Luke the family of Jesus belong to Nazareth ; in Matthew the family settles in Nazareth after the return from Egypt, in order to fulfil a prophecy. (*b*) The Resurrection-narratives contain very many divergences. (*c*) For examples on a smaller scale, examine the following :—(1) Matt. 12^{9-14}=Mark 3^{1-6} =Luke 6^{6-11}. This is the story of the man with a withered hand. Matthew records that the bystanders asked Jesus whether it was lawful to heal on the sabbath day. In Mark and Luke it is Jesus who puts that question to the bystanders. (2) Matt. 8^{5-13}=Luke 7^{1-10} ; the cure of the centurion's servant. In Matthew the centurion addresses Jesus directly, beseeching him to come, and protesting his unworthiness of the honour. In Luke the centurion, hearing about Jesus, sends elders of the Jews as a deputation, and later, a second deputation of his friends ; and it is from the mouth of these friends that the words come to Jesus, ' I am not worthy that thou shouldst come under my roof.' (3) Matt. 20^{29-34}=Mark 10^{46-52}=Luke 18^{35-43} : cure of the blind at Jericho. The narratives here are at cross-purposes in two ways. Mark and Luke agree in reporting that Jesus cured a blind man ; but Matthew says there were two blind men. Matthew and Mark say the cure took place when Jesus was leaving Jericho ; Luke, when Jesus was entering Jericho. So that Matthew and Mark agree against Luke in the point of time but differ about the number ; Mark and Luke agree against Matthew about the number, but differ upon the point of time. (4) Mark 1^{32-34}=Matt. 8^{16}=Luke 4^{40-41}. There are some curious little verbal differences here. In Mark, all are brought and many are healed. In Matthew, many are brought and all that are sick are healed. In Luke all that had any sick brought them to Jesus, and everyone of them is restored.

These specimens of variation could easily be extended. They have not been quoted captiously, in order to show how the gospels contradict each other ; but they have been given as necessary illustrations of a frequent feature of the narratives, which requires explanation in any attempt to understand the relations of the gospels to each other.

10.—Evidence from the Early Church

Christianity soon became a literary movement, and most periods of its history are rich in writings which throw light on its circumstances and development. Unfortunately the early Christian literature gives only a little helpful material for the solution of the Synoptic problem.

For one thing the literature is scanty at the very period when we most need it : viz., the first half of the second century. As one scholar has remarked, ecclesiastical history ' goes through a tunnel ' in the first half of the second century. For another thing, the Synoptic Problem, as we understand it, was not realised then as a problem at all. Writers were for the most part gratefully receptive of what was known to them, and either did not recognise the discrepancies or did not attach any special significance to them.

What testimony there is for the most part concerns the origin of the separate gospels ; and here PAPIAS, bishop of Hierapolis about 140 A.D., gives us some valuable evidence, although its exact meaning is by no means certain. Papias, whose words are preserved for us by the historian Eusebius, quotes an Elder named John as his authority for the following :— ' Mark was Peter's interpreter, and wrote

down exactly all that he remembered—not however in order—of the things said or done by Christ. For he neither heard the Lord nor followed him; but . . . he became a follower of Peter, who used to adapt his teaching to the needs of the moment, but did not give, as it were, a connected account of the Lord's sayings; so that Mark is perfectly correct in his statements, but in the manner I have indicated, he only wrote down detached parts of the Lord's history, just as Peter recalled them. For he took care with regard to one thing, not to omit anything that he heard, nor to falsify anything thereof.' Again, Papias states the following fact. 'Matthew composed the Sayings in the Hebrew dialect, and each one interpreted them as he was able.' Another passage in Papias is worth quoting, as showing that in his time living tradition still held an important place. 'I asked what Andrew or what Peter said, or what Philip or what Thomas or James, or John or Matthew, or any other of the Lord's disciples; and what Aristion and the Elder John, the disciples of the Lord, say; for I thought that what I got from books would not do me so much good as what I got from a living and abiding voice.'

JUSTIN (died 163–167) quotes many passages more or less parallel with Matthew and Luke, and a few from Mark; one or two passages may depend on the fourth gospel, and there are some others which have no original in our four gospels. He does not mention any of our gospels by name, but gives as his authority the Memoirs (Apomnenoneumata) of the Apostles; and he tells us that these Memoirs were read on Sundays in the Christian worship along with the Prophets.

IRENAEUS (died about 189), TERTULLIAN (died about 220), CLEMENT OF ALEXANDRIA (died about 215) all give our four gospels the authoritative place; but they also occasionally quote other writings for occasional facts or arguments. In Irenaeus there is a famous passage in which he endeavours to prove the necessity in the nature of things for four and only four gospels; and though the arguments he uses do not appeal to us now, the passage is strong evidence for the exclusive regard for our four gospels which had grown up by his time.

Some scattered fragments from other sources show us that the differences between the four gospels were not altogether overlooked, and that some misgivings were felt about them. In the CANON OF MURATORI (of which the original dates from about 200 A.D.) it is remarked 'Though the beginnings are differently handed down in each book of the gospel, nevertheless it makes no difference to the faith of believers.' This argument, which has been repeated thousands of times since, is perhaps an echo from POLYCARP (died 155); in a fragment from him the passage occurs, 'The Evangelists reasonably differ in the beginnings of their respective gospels, though their intention in proclaiming the gospel is indisputably one and the same.' In the controversy between the ALOGI and the MONTANISTS (late middle of second century) the first rumblings are heard of the volcano of criticism against the authority of the Fourth Gospel. MARCION (about 150) constructed a gospel of his own which seems to have been based on the Third Gospel only.

Before the end of the second century, however, the Four Gospels are generally recognised by the Church as of equal value and authority. The work of TATIAN (160–180) shows something of the attitude which had grown up towards them. In Tatian we have the first of the harmonists. Writing in Syriac for the Church of Edessa he composed a Diatessaron, that is, 'a Gospel through Four.' It was a consecutive narrative of the life and teaching of Jesus, woven out of the materials of our four gospels.

In the fourth century Chrysostom offered the suggestion that the agreements between the Evangelists prove their truthfulness, and the divergences their independence; but Augustine, in the same century, was the first scholar to make any serious attempt to explain the literary relations of the gospels. In a treatise called 'The Concord between the Evangelists' he described Mark as the follower and abbreviator of Matthew. With Augustine, however, literary criticism stopped short. It was not until the eighteenth century that scholarship, already exercised upon Greek, Roman, and Old Testament literature, turned to the Gospels, and began to realise the complexity of the question of their origin and relations.

(*To be continued.*)

NOTES FOR TEACHERS
XIX.—XXIX.

Nine Lessons on the Origin of the Doctrine of the Trinity

ARTHUR W. FOX, M.A.

XIX.—The Unity of God

I.—The Unity of God is plainly pointed to by nature and science. All forces and phenomena point to one great First Cause bringing everything into being and directing everything by the process of evolution.

II.—The Bible knows nothing of the doctrine of the Trinity. Over and over again the Divine Unity is plainly taught. the word unity covers person, character, and being. The Trinity divides into opposing elements the person and character of God.

(*a*) The *Pentateuch*, which contains the Laws of the Jews, emphatically teaches the unity of God. Deuteronomy vi. 4, 'Hear, O Israel, the Lord our God is ONE Lord,' gives the one consistent message of the Old Testament.

(*b*) The prophet-preachers teach the same great lesson. To *Isaiah* all other gods save the ONE Jehovah are 'idols,' e.g. Isaiah ii. 18. The Second Isaiah is even more emphatic, see xlii. 1–9, where the wondrous power of the ONE Jehovah is discussed. So too the writers of the Psalms without exception sing in praise of or prayer to the ONE Jehovah. Cf. Psalm xcvi. 5, also the whole of Psalm cxv.

(*c*) The New Testament is no less emphatic, though some of its texts have been made to mean what they did not mean to their original writers.

(*d*) Jesus endorsed the confession of Deuteronomy, that there was 'One only God'; cf. St. Mark xii. 29. He also says, explicitly to the ruler of the synagogue 'Why callest thou me good? None is good save ONE, God,' St. Mark x. 18. He also says 'My Father is greater than I,' St. John xiv. 28. Throughout his teaching this great truth is implied even in St. John, though he had a different idea of the person of Jesus from that given in the first three Gospels. Of that more will be said later. Here it need only be remarked that the words 'I and the Father are *one thing*,' St. John x. 30, imply unity of character not of person. Jesus means to say 'My Father's will and purpose are mine.' St. Paul uses the neuter word for 'One thing' in the same way in I. Corinthians iii. 7: 'Now he that planteth and he that watereth are *one thing*,' by which he means unity of will and purpose, not that he and Apollos are one person.

(*e*) St. Paul, who had a different conception of Jesus as the Christ from the Gospel writers, emphatically proclaims his belief in the invisible *unity* of God. Galatians iii. 20, 'Now a mediator is not of one, but God is ONE.' Cf. Romans iii. 30. So in I. Corinthians viii. 4 he says emphatically, 'There is *no* God but ONE.' In the following verses (5, 6), after affirming that the Gentiles had 'gods many and lords many,' he goes on to say, 'To us there is but ONE God, the Father . . . and one Lord Jesus Christ,' meaning by 'Lord' not God but 'the risen Christ.' Once more in I. Timothy ii. 5 he says, 'There is ONE God, one mediator also between God and man, *himself man*, Christ Jesus.' Finally, in Ephesians iv. 6 are the words 'ONE God and Father of all.' Plainly then St. Paul taught the unity of God, though some of his teaching concerning the Christ may have led others to make Jesus into God.

(*f*) James the brother of Jesus says, ii. 19, 'Thou believest God is ONE, thou doest well,' etc.

So the Bible teaches plainly the absolute unity of God.

XX.—The Deity of Christ

I.—*Jesus never claims to be God.*

II.—His humanity is clearly shewn from the following facts about him.

(*a*) He began his ministry as a *preacher of repentance*. St. Mark i. 14, 15, 'Now after that John was put in prison, Jesus came into Galilee, preaching the gospel (good news) of the kingdom of God, and saying, The time is fulfilled, and the kingdom of God is at hand; *repent* ye, and believe the gospel.' Cf. St. Matt. iv. 17. He took up the mission of John the Baptist, when John was imprisoned.

(*b*) He calls himself a *prophet*, which clearly shews that he never thought himself to be God. St. Matt. xiii. 57, 'A *prophet* is not without honour, save in his own country, and in his own house.' Cf. St.

Luke iv. 24; St. John iv. 44, 'For Jesus himself testified, that a *prophet* hath no honour in his own country.' Cf. St. Mark vi. 4.

(*c*) Jesus never calls himself *Son of God*, but always *Son of Man*. Both of these were *interchangeable titles* of the *Jewish Messiah*. Moreover, Ezekiel frequently calls himself 'Son of Man' (Ezek. ii. 6). St. Mark ii. 10, ix. 31, x. 33; St. Luke vii. 34, and in many other passages.

(*d*) Jesus calls himself *the sower*. St. Matt. xiii. 3; St. Mark iv. 3, 14; St. Luke viii. 5. 'Behold the *sower* went forth to sow.'

(*e*) Jesus says *power was given to him by God*. St. Matt. xi. 27, 'All things have been *delivered* unto me by my Father.' Cf. xxviii. 18; St. Luke x. 22.

(*f*) Jesus *prays*. If he were God to whom could he pray? St. Matt. xxvi. 38–46. Cf. St. Luke ix. 18, 'as he was alone praying'; xxii. 39–46.

(*g*) Jesus was *ignorant* of some things. St. Mark xiii. 32, 'But of that day and that hour knoweth no one, not even the angels in heaven, neither the *Son*, but the Father.'

(*h*) Jesus says that he must *suffer physical pain*, which cannot be said of God. St. Matt. xvi. 21, xxi. 33–46. Cf. St. Luke ix. 22; St. Mark viii. 31.

(*i*) Jesus was *dependent* upon God. St. Mark xv. 34, 'My God, my God, why hast Thou forsaken me?' St. Matt. xxvii. 46. Cf. St. Luke xxiii. 46, 'Father, into Thy hands I commend my spirit.'

(*k*) Jesus calls himself *Master*. St. Matt. xxiii. 8–10, 'One is your *master*, even the Christ.' Master in this passage in its first use means *teacher*, in its second *leader*.

(*l*) Jesus accepts the title of *the Christ*, that is the *Messiah*, who was spiritually to regenerate his nation. St. Matt. xxii. 42, xvi. 13–17; St. Mark viii. 27–32. So he calls himself *Lord*, which is not unlike our *sir*, as *anointed prophet*, St. Matt. xxii. 41–46. As Messiah he is *Lord* of the Sabbath, St. Matt. xii. 8; St. Mark ii. 28.

(*m*) Lastly he says there is *one* God and *one* only, St. Mark xii. 29–34. He refuses the title *good*, because '*One* only is good, God,' St. Mark x. 18.

III.—From these twelve propositions the humanity of Jesus is clearly proved. The words quoted are his own, and 'He spake as one having authority, and not as the Scribes.' Throughout the Gospels we see no claims put forward by him to any higher title than that of the *Christ* or *Messiah*. The Jews were expecting a great King of the house of David, who would have supernatural powers given to him by God, to deliver them from the rule of the Romans. Jesus at first believed himself to be a *prophet* like those who had gone before him. Gradually a sense of his real power grew into his soul, and he realised that he was a *spiritual Messiah to wean men from sin*.

XXI.—The Manhood of Jesus. The Testimony of the Disciples

I.—*The Virgin-Birth*. The chapters (St. Matt. i. ii.; St. Luke i. ii.) containing the *Virgin-birth* of Jesus are not in St. Mark or St. John. St. Paul knew nothing of this legend, nor St. Peter nor St. James, 'the *brother* of Jesus.' The idea is founded on a false translation of Isaiah vii. 14, 'Behold, the *young bride* shall conceive,' by the *Septuagint*, or the translation of the Hebrew Bible into Greek by the *Seventy-two* Elders of Alexandria. The verse itself refers to the *wife* of Ahaz, or of the prophet himself, most probably of the latter.

II.—Jesus was *baptised*, which could not be done to God, St. Matt. iii. 13–17; St. Luke iii. 21, 22; St. Mark i. 9–11; St. John i. 32–34. The Baptism excludes the Virgin-birth; for each was told to explain the outpouring of the Spirit of God into Jesus.

III.—Jesus was *tempted*, St. Matt. iv. 1–11; St. Mark i. 12–13; St. Luke iv. 1–15, which cannot be said of God. Cf. St. James i. 13, 'God cannot be tempted with evil, neither tempteth He any man.'

IV.—According to the Disciples Jesus *worked miracles*, or 'gave manifestations of power,' St. Matt. viii. 2, ix. 1–8; St. Mark i. 21–45, etc., and *gave this power* to the Disciples, St. Matt. x. 1; St. Luke ix. 1. But the miracles when examined dwindle down in most cases to *natural cures of epileptic madness*. Cf. Legion, St. Mark v. 1–20. The raising of Jairus' daughter, who was 'not dead but sleeping,' i.e., in a *trance*, St. Matt. ix. 18–26; St. Mark v. 21–43; St. Luke viii. 41–56. Or to a *parable* translated into a *miracle*, e.g., the *feeding of the multitude*, St. Matt. xiv. 15–21; St. Mark vi. 33–44. Jesus said,

'I am the living bread, which came down from heaven,' St. John vi. 48–51. He spoke of his followers as 'eating his flesh.' Of course he was speaking in *parables*. From some such *parable* the *miracle* story has grown. Similarly other miracles may be explained.

V.—Jesus began his *ministry* in Galilee, St. Matt. iv. 12–17; St. Luke viii. 4, thus clearly shewing that he was a *minister of God*, not God himself; or a *teacher* filled with inspiration by God.

VI.—*Human attributes of Jesus.* (a) He grew *hungry*, St. Matt. iv. 2; St. Luke iv. 2. (b) He was called *Master* and *accepted the title*, St. Matt. xix. 16, xxiii. 7–10, xxvi. 25, and often elsewhere. (c) He was *tempted*, v. III. above. (d) He was thought to be about to establish an *earthly* kingdom, St. Matt. xx. 21, a circumstance which clearly shews that the Disciples at all events thought him to be the *human Jewish Messiah*. (c) He *felt triumph* at his entry into Jerusalem, St. Matt. xxi. 1–11, another clear indication of his simple *humanity*. He felt and hoped that he would bring many in the capital of his race to listen to his words of life.

VII.—Jesus was pronounced by St. Peter to be 'a *man* approved by God,' etc. Acts ii. 22–35.

VIII.—The Disciples, who had seen Jesus, believed him to be MAN, as we are, but sinless.'

IX.—They did indeed credit him with miracles; but every prophet was expected to give such '*signs of power*.' Here it may be noted that miracles do not prove the *deity* of Jesus, but rather *the contrary*. God works by *law*, not by *miracle*. All His acts are the offspring of His will; hence they are not miracles to Him, but thoughts. Moreover, if miracles be held to prove *deity*, then would Moses, Joshua, Elijah, Elisha and a host of others be also God, to say nothing of those who followed Jesus.

X.—Our *first step* in the *exaltation* of Jesus is the *working of miracles*.

XXII.—St. Paul's Contribution

I.—St. Paul, who may never have seen Jesus, and who seldom mentions his life and teaching, has given us many speculations concerning the nature and office of the Christ. The misunderstanding of these has led to the idea of the *deity* of Christ, which the great Apostle never taught.

II.—(*a*) He always calls him 'Lord,' not in the sense of God, but as the 'risen Christ.' E.g. Romans i. 7, vi. 23.

(*b*) He calls him 'son of God' in a special sense as the *Christ*. E.g. Romans v. 10, and many other passages. Hence theologians began to think that Jesus was the 'only Son of God,' and turned him into 'God the Son,' a phrase and idea never found in the Bible.

(*c*) He represents Jesus as having come to fulfil a 'ministry of reconciliation,' not however of *God* to *man*, but of *man* to *God*. E.g. II. Corinthians v. 19, and many similar passages in his Letters.

(*d*) Taking the old Genesis account of Adam as the first man, he teaches that Adam by his sin brought death into the world of his descendants, whereas Jesus brought the rising of the dead to those who 'believed in him.' This doctrine is set forth at length in I. Corinthians xv. 12–58. Here the Apostle would seem to indicate his belief that the Christ was pre-existent. He says, verse 47, 'The first man is of the earth earthy, the second man is out of heaven.' If the words 'second man' refer to Jesus, they would seem to imply not that he was God, but that he was 'the heavenly man come down from heaven' to bring men back to God. Others say the meaning is this. 'As Adam was the first of the earthly-minded creation, so Jesus was the first of the heavenly-minded creation,' who by conquering death gave life to others. The first of these interpretations seems to be confirmed by such passages as Ephesians iv. 7–9. It is quite true that verse 9 may mean 'he who descended into the grave is the same with him who ascended into heaven.' This meaning gives very good sense. It is to be noted that in the same chapter, verses 5 and 6, Jesus is plainly distinguished from God, who is said to be ONE. Still there are grounds for believing that St. Paul taught that Jesus was the pre-existent heavenly man, who came down from heaven, surrendered his heavenly manhood to be merely mortal to bring men back to God. Cf. Philippians ii. 1–8.

(*e*) From the last-named quotation an elaborate doctrine known as the 'Kenosis'

or 'emptying' has been drawn with some violence to the meaning of St. Paul. It is taught that 'God the Son emptied himself of his Godhead to become man and take away our sins.' St Paul probably means that 'equality with God was not a temptation to the Christ, but that he surrendered his heavenly manhood to become as it were a slave, that he might win man to God.'

III.—In our brief space we can only hint at the thoughts of the great Apostle, which are his own. When we want to know what Jesus was we must go to his own words, as they are represented in the first three Gospels. In this respect the Fourth Gospel is not of equal weight, as it represents a theological theory about the Christ, which may or may not be correct, rather than the real man, as he actually lived. But from the foregoing notes it will be easily seen how St. Paul has been pressed into service in the gradual development of the Doctrine of the Trinity.

XXIII.—St. John's Contribution

I.—The *Divine Word* (St. John i. 1) is the *reason* of God, which He *made flesh* in the *Jewish Prophets* and *Poets* and in an *especial* degree in *Jesus*. St. John i. 14. By virtue of this *indwelling spirit* Jesus was *before Abraham*, St. John viii. 58, i.e. he was *before Abraham* in the *mind* and *purpose of God*.

II.—The words *only-begotten son* of the *Father* are applied to Jesus, St. John i. 18, iii. 16. Here the word *only-begotten* means *best beloved*, or the *son of promise*. Cf. Heb. xi. 17, where Isaac is called the 'only-begotten son' of Abraham, in spite of Ishmael and the sons of Keturah. As through Isaac the Jewish race came into being, so through Jesus did the Christian community, a new race of spiritually-minded people. N.B.—In St. John i. 14 the correct translation is 'we beheld his glory, the glory of a father's only begotten son.' St. John i. 18 means that Jesus, as existing in the mind of God, before he was born upon earth, alone knew God and was able to reveal Him to men.

III.—Jesus was 'the lamb of God, which taketh away the sin of the world,' St. John i. 29, 36. St. John tries to shew that Jesus was the *Paschal Lamb*, so he has represented him as *crucified* on the *day* of the *Feast* of the *Passover*, an *act forbidden by the Jewish Law*. As the *Paschal Lamb* made those Jews who partook of it *part of the Israel of God*, so Jesus made his disciples the *true people of God*. He 'took away the sins of the world' by *shewing men how to live*.

IV.—Jesus was the *Jewish Messiah*, who was the *Messiah to the world*, St. John iv. 25, 26, and therefore Man; a *prophet*, and therefore *man*, iv. 19; the *Saviour of the world*, iv. 42. That is the man who could wean the men and women of the world from their sins.

V.—Jesus was the *son of Joseph and Mary*, St. John vi. 42, therefore he was most assuredly *man*.

VI.—Jesus has his *chief ministry in Jerusalem*, St. John v. 1, viii. 1, x. 22, etc., which is *opposed* to the *statements* of the *first three Gospels*, and is probably wrong. Indeed, the *Fourth Gospel* gives rather a *theory* of Jesus, than an *exact historical representation of him*.

VII.—Jesus was *dependent upon God*, St. John v. 30.

VIII.—Jesus was *one with the Father*, St. John x. 30, 'I and the Father are one thing,' not *one person*. Cf. I. Cor. iii. 8, 'He that planteth (Paul), and he that watereth (Apollos) are *one thing*.' St. John xvii. 21 shews how Jesus prays that his disciples may 'be one' with him in God.

IX.—The Jews sought to *kill* Jesus upon one occasion, who replied, 'why seek ye to kill me, a *man* who hath told you the truth,' St. John viii. 40. He hid himself from them, a purely human act, xi. 54. Ch. v. 18, vii. 19, viii. 40, viii. 59.

X.—Jesus *ate* and *drank*, St. John ii. 1–11, xiii. 21–30, and *died*. Therefore he was man, xix. 5, 'Behold the man.'

XI.—St. John believed Jesus to be *man filled* with *inspiration of God, to have been in the mind and purpose of God before Abraham, to* have held his *chief ministry in Jerusalem*, to be the *Christ*, the *best-beloved son* of God, who by his sonship was able to reveal the sonship of others. Under all these relations he was *man*, but the *especial man whose soul was in perfect harmony with the will of God*.

XII.—St. Paul was the author of the doctrine of Jesus as the 'man from heaven,' St. John of his being in part 'the Word of

God.' From these two spiritual conceptions grew the doctrine of the 'deity of Christ.'

XXIV.—The Deity of Christ

I.—As has been said, the doctrine of the *deity* of the Christ has arisen from a misunderstanding of the teaching of St. Paul and St. John. Even so it was of gradual growth and was by no means universal so late as 150 A.D. Nor was God the Son thought to be equal with God the Father until the middle of the fourth century. Nor was the Holy Ghost deified until the Council of Constantinople of 381 A.D.

II.—*The Unitarian Period.*

(*a*) *Clement of Rome*, A.D. 96, was not Trinitarian, neither did he think Jesus to be God, as will be manifest from the following passages of his *Letter to the Church at Corinth.* N.B.—The word *Lord* is applied to Jesus in distinction from God, as St. Paul does, whose disciple Clement may have been. *Sect.* 20, 'All these things the great CREATOR and LORD of the universe has ordained to be in peace and harmony; blessing all, but most abundantly us, who have fled to HIS mercy, *through* our Lord Jesus Christ.' *Sect.* 32, 'We then, who are called by HIS WILL, *in* Jesus Christ.' *Sect.* 42, 'The Apostles preached the Gospel to us from the Lord Jesus Christ; Jesus Christ from God. Christ therefore was sent out by God, and the Apostles by Christ. Both these events were ordered by the *will of* God.' *Sect.* 48, 'HAVE we not ONE GOD, and one Christ? Is there not one spirit of grace poured upon us, and one calling in Christ?' *Sect.* 49, 'On account of the love he bore us, Christ our Lord gave his blood (his life) for us by the *will* of God.' *Sect.* 50, 'This blessedness is the lot of those who are chosen by GOD, *through* Jesus Christ our Lord.' *Sect.* 58. 'The ALL-SEEING GOD, the master of spirits, and the LORD of all flesh, who hath *chosen* our Lord Jesus Christ, and us *through* him.' *Sect.* 59, 'The grace of our Lord Jesus Christ be with you, and with all those who have been everywhere called by GOD, *through* him (Jesus); through whom (Jesus) to HIM (God) be glory, honour, power and majesty, an everlasting throne from eternity to eternity. Amen.' In all these passages it is quite clear that Jesus was not God, but *chosen* and *sent* by God to lead souls to Him.

(*b*) *Polycarp of Smyrna* (A.D. 108), who derived a somewhat mystical tone from St. John, whose disciple he is believed to have been. Still he is not Trinitarian, nor a believer in the deity of Christ. The following passages are taken from his *Letter to the Philippians*, his only surviving work. *Sect.* 1, 'Polycarp and the Elders with him, to the Church of GOD, which sojourneth at Philippi; mercy and peace be multiplied unto you from GOD ALMIGHTY and the Lord Jesus Christ, our Saviour.' *Sect.* 2, 'Believing in HIM who raised our Lord Jesus Christ from the dead, and gave him glory, and a throne at His right hand.' *Sect.* 3, 'Hope following, love preceding, namely love to GOD, to Christ, and to our neighbour.' *Sect* 5, 'Likewise the deacons, that they be blameless before HIM in righteousness, as ministers of GOD and of Christ, and not of men.' *Sect.* 12, 'The GOD and FATHER of our Lord Jesus Christ, and the perpetual High-priest himself, the Son of God, Christ Jesus, build you up in faith and truth, and in all meekness . . . and grant to you a lot and portion among his saints, and to us with you, and to all under heaven, who believe in our Lord Jesus Christ, and in his FATHER, who raised him from the dead.' *Sect.* 5, 'We ought therefore to abstain from all these (sins), and to be subject to the Presbyters and Deacons, as to GOD, and to Christ.'

From these passages it is quite clear that Polycarp believed Jesus to be a different being from God, and that he did not *rise*, but *was raised* from the dead by GOD.

(*c*) *The Teaching of the Twelve Apostles*, between 65 and 75 A.D. Bryennios now Patriarch of Nikomedia discovered this early little tract in 1875 in the Monastery on Mt. Athos. Its date is uncertain, but very early. It would seem to have been written in Syria or Palestine, and probably represents the actual teaching of the older Apostles. It is chiefly employed in practical directions, and is *Unitarian* throughout. The only doubtful passage is in *Sect.* 7. 'Baptise in the name of the *Father* and of the *Son* and of the *Holy Spirit*'; cf. St. Matt. xxviii. 19, where the same words are found. Their meaning is this, 'Baptise in the name of the *Father* as His *worshippers*, in the name of the *Son*

as his *disciples*, in the name of the *Holy Spirit* as trusting to receive it.' The *older* baptismal formula would be 'Baptise in the name of the *Son*.' But the later form is not Trinitarian, as we have seen. The gift of the *Holy Spirit* to the Christian convert was believed to be given at his baptism, sometimes from that rite, sometimes from the laying on of hands which immediately followed it. In the case of Jesus it came immediately after his baptism.

Throughout the tract Jesus is styled *Lord, never* GOD, twice *the Son of God*, once the *Christ*. *Lord* means the *risen Christ*. The first *eight Sections* are an account of the *two ways of living*, the *way of life*, that is the *way of goodness*, and the *way of death*, that is of *sin*. *Sections* 9–16 deal with *church-rites* and *discipline*.

The *first part* of the tract abounds in quotations from the words of Jesus, especially from the *Sermon on the Mount*. In the following *Sections* from which quotations are taken, the *representative* of Jesus is to be treated as *Jesus* himself. *Sect.* 4, 'My child, thou shalt remember him that *speaketh* unto thee the word of God night and day, and shalt honour him as the *Lord*; for whencesoever the *Lordship* speaketh, there is the *Lord*'; i.e., as Jesus spoke the word of God, so he that speaks in the name of Jesus, speaks the word of God and is to be reverenced. *Sect.* 4, 'Thou shalt hate . . . everything that is not pleasing to the *Lord*. Thou shalt never forsake the commandments of the *Lord*.' *Sect.* 8, 'Neither pray ye as the hypocrites, but as the *Lord* commanded in his *Gospel*,' followed by the *Lord's Prayer*, as we find it in St. Matt. vi. 9–13. *Sect.* 9, contains an account of the *Lord's Supper* (*Eucharist*), which need not be quoted in full. Here *Jesus* is called '*the holy vine of Thy Son David*, which Thou madest known to us *through Thy son Jesus*.' There are these words, 'For Thine is the glory and power *through Jesus* Christ forever and ever.' That is to say, the power *manifested through Jesus*. No one was to partake of the *Eucharist* or *thanksgiving-feast*, 'but they that have been *baptised* into the name of the *Lord*.' These words imply the *earlier* baptismal formula mentioned above. Those who partake of the *Eucharist*, are to thank God for the revelation made *through His son Jesus*, who is expected to come again on the 'clouds of heaven' (16). *Sect.* 14, 'On the *Lord's own day* the disciples are bidden to meet, to join in a common meal, giving thanks and confessing their sins. *Sect.* 15, Bishops and deacons are to be appointed *worthy of the Lord*. The *Gospel* is called the *good-tidings* of the *Lord*, as uttered by him. *Sect.* 16, The writer looks forward to the *speedy second coming* of Jesus.

This little tract is *Unitarian* in essence, stresses the need of Christian conduct, and plainly deems Jesus to be *other than God*.

XXV.—Semi-Trinitarianism (i.)

I.—During this period Jesus was believed to be a *divine being, a* DEITY, but *far inferior* to GOD MOST HIGH; similarly the Holy Spirit gradually came to be regarded as *a* deity, but *lower* in rank than the Christ. So there was no Trinity in Unity; but in heaven there were *three chief* divine beings, of a descending order in magnitude: the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit.

II.—*Justin Martyr*, A.D. 140.

He was a native of Palestine, trained in the schools of Greek philosophy, who became a Christian in or about 133 A.D. His chief works were his two *Apologies* (defences) on behalf of Christianity. He is the first to deify Christ. Even so he *never made* Jesus *equal with* the Father. His *Dialogue with Trypho*, a Jew, is of much importance for our present purpose. In it, p. 411, he says: 'Neither Abraham, Isaac, nor Jacob saw the FATHER and INEFFABLE LORD OF ALL, even of *Christ himself*; but (they saw) him, who by HIS WILL was God, HIS Son, and an angel (messenger) from his being *subservient* to HIS WILL, who at HIS pleasure was made man from the Virgin, who also on one occasion appeared in the form of fire, conversing with Moses from the bush.' Again he says, *Dial.*, p. 413: 'The GOD of heaven is the LORD of that Lord, who was upon earth, being his FATHER and GOD, the CAUSE of his existence, and of his being powerful, and Lord, and God.' Justin believed that Christ made all things under the *express* WILL OF GOD, v. *Dial.* p. 252, 'I will try to show, that he who appeared to Abraham, Jacob, and Moses, and who is called God in the Scripture (*Old Testament*) is different from the GOD WHO MADE ALL THINGS; *numerically*

different, but the same in *will*. For I say that he never did anything but what that GOD WHO MADE ALL THINGS, and above WHOM is no God, *willed* that he should do and say.' Clearly then in Justin's view Jesus was *inferior* to GOD, though a God: cf. *Dial.* p. 249, 'I will try to convince you that there is another, who is called God and Lord, besides HIM WHO MADE ALL THINGS, who is called an angel (messenger), from his delivering to man, whatever HE WHO IS THE MAKER OF ALL THINGS, and above WHOM is no GOD, *wills* that he should deliver.' We see then that Justin Martyr, who suffered torture and death after a life of great piety, did not believe in a Trinity of three equal, co-eval and infinite persons, such as is laid down by the Athanasian Creed. To him there was GOD supreme, by WHOSE WILL everything was made and done on earth. Second to HIM was Jesus the Christ, who though a God, or divine being, was not infinite like the FATHER, but CAUSED by HIM, and therefore brought into being in *time*. He is also called an *angel* or *messenger* of GOD. It is through him as an *instrument* that God made all things.

III.—This doctrine of the *pre-existence* and *deity* of Christ was by no means universal in the Church in the time of Justin, who was a man of striking candour. In his argument with Trypho, the Jew, he clearly felt the difficulty of proving his doctrine without being convicted of a belief in *two Gods*. He also does not deny the title of brethren to those who did not accept it. He says, *Dial.* p. 233, 'It will not follow that he is not the Christ, though I should NOT BE ABLE TO PROVE that he *pre-existed* as God, the Son of HIM WHO HATH MADE ALL THINGS, and that he only became a man by the Virgin . . . it will be right to say, that in this ONLY I have been MISTAKEN. For there are those of our race, who acknowledge him to be the Christ, but they say that *he was a man, born of men*.

XXVI.—Semi-Trinitarianism (ii.)

Irenæus, A.D. 178

Irenæus was the disciple of *Polycarp*, and bishop of Lyons. He wrote a *Defence of Christianity*. He certainly believed that Jesus was *God* in a certain sense, but *less* than God the Father. He says: 'Our Lord himself, the Son of GOD, acknowledged that the FATHER *only* knew the Day of Judgment; declaring expressly, that of that day and that hour knoweth no man, neither the Son, but the FATHER *only*.' Again he says: 'Since our Lord is the only teacher of truth, we should learn of him, that the FATHER is *above all*' (*Lib.* ii. 48, 49). Once more: 'We hold fast the rule of truth, which is, that there is ONE GOD ALMIGHTY, Who created all things *through His Word*. This is the FATHER of our Lord Jesus Christ' (*Lib.* i. 4). Similarly: 'This GOD is the FATHER of our Lord Jesus Christ, and of HIM it is that Paul declared, There is ONE GOD, even THE FATHER, WHO is above all, and through all, and in us all' (*Lib.* ii. 2). Finally: 'We believe in ONE GOD, the MAKER of heaven and earth, and of all things therein, *through* Jesus Christ, the *Son* of God' (*Lib.* iii. 4). From these passages it is clear that while *Irenæus* believed Jesus to be God, he did not believe him to be *equal* with GOD the FATHER.

Clement of Alexandria, A.D. 194.

He was head of the catechetical school in Alexandria, that is, of the school wherein young Christians were trained. He says: 'Be thou initiated, and join the chorus with the angels, about HIM WHO is the UNBEGOTTEN and IMMORTAL, the ONLY TRUE GOD: *God the Word* accompanying us in our songs of praise. This perpetual Jesus, the one great *High-Priest* of the ONE GOD, WHO is also his FATHER, prays for men and encourages men' (*Ad. Gentes*, p. 74). Again: 'Our Lord taught that GOD THE FATHER ONLY is *supreme* over all, Whom none knew but the Son' (*Strom.* 7). Once more: 'The *Mediator* performs the will of the FATHER. The *Word* is the Mediator, being common to both, the Son of God and the Saviour of men. Of the ONE he is the *servant*, but *our* instructor' (*Paedag. Lib.* iii. I.). Thus Clement believed Jesus to be God, but *inferior* to the FATHER.

Tertullian, A.D. 200.

He was a presbyter of Carthage, who strove to prove the *Monarchy*, or *sole supremacy* of GOD by representing the Son as *derived* from HIM and possessed of power delegated by HIM. He says: 'But I, who *derive* the *Son* from no other original than the *substance* of the FATHER, supposing him to *do nothing* but by the *will* of the

FATHER, and to have *received* all his power *from* the FATHER, how is it that I destroy the belief of the MONARCHY, which I preserve in the *Son*, being *delivered* by the FATHER to him' (*Ad. Praxeam* 3, p. 502). Again: 'The *Son* always appeared, and the *Son* always acted by the *authority* and *will* of the FATHER; because the *Son* can do nothing *of himself*, but what he seeth the FATHER do' (*Ad. Prax.* 15). Once more, commenting on John x. 30: 'I and my FATHER are *one thing*,' he says, 'Christ says *one*, using a neuter form, which does not convey the idea of singleness (of *person* or of *being*) but of unison, likeness, conjunction, the love of the FATHER to the *Son*, and the obedience of the *Son* to the FATHER'S *will*' (*Ad. Prax.* 22). Finally he says: 'I do not absolutely say, that there are Gods and Lords, but I follow the Apostle (I Cor. viii. 6); and if the FATHER and *Son* are to be named together, I call the FATHER GOD, and Jesus Christ Lord; though I call Christ God, when speaking of *himself alone*' (*Ad Prax.* 13). These passages were taken from a work of Tertullian's written to refute Praxeas, a Unitarian. They clearly shew that he held Jesus to be a *lesser* God than the FATHER. Tertullian first used the Latin word *Trinity*.

XXVII.—Semi-Trinitarianism (iii.)

Origen, A.D. 230.

He was an Egyptian, who succeeded *Clement of Alexandria* as head of the catechetical school in that city. He was a great theologian, who suffered much for daring to think for himself. He believed that the FATHER greatly excelled the *Son*. He says: 'We maintain, that the *Saviour* and the *Holy Spirit* are as much, or even more excelled by the FATHER than he (Christ) and the *Holy Spirit* excel other things; still *he* (Christ), though excelling such and such mighty things (e.g., thrones, and the various angels) in essence, and office, and power, and *godhead*, is not to be in any respect *compared* with the FATHER' (*Com. Vol. ii.* p. 218). Again he says: 'We may by this means solve the doubts of many men, who profess great piety, and who are afraid of making *two Gods*; for we must tell them, that He Who is GOD OF HIMSELF, is THE GOD, as even our *Saviour* affirms in his prayer to his FATHER, that they may know THEE THE ONLY TRUE GOD; but whatsoever is God besides that self-existent person, being divine by *partaking of* HIS divinity, cannot be styled THE GOD, but severally *A God*; among whom especially is the *first-born of all things* (that is *Christ*) (*Com. Vol. ii.* p. 47). Once more he says: 'If we would learn what prayer is, we must take care not to pray to any creature; no not even to *Christ himself*, but to the GOD and FATHER of the universe *alone*, to WHOM our Saviour himself offered up his prayers' (*De Orat.* p. 42). Thus *Origen* considered Jesus as *divine*, because he partook of the nature of GOD, but deemed him to be far less than the FATHER, to WHOM alone prayer was to be offered.

Novatian, A.D. 251.

He was a Presbyter of Rome, who founded a sect, which refused to readmit into the Church those who had committed great crimes. He believed that Jesus was God, though not with the same power as the FATHER. He says: 'The same rule of truth teaches us to believe *after* the FATHER, upon the *Son* of GOD, Christ Jesus our Lord, our *God*, yet the *Son* of GOD, of that GOD WHO IS ONE and ALONE, the MAKER OF ALL THINGS' (ix. p. 26). Again he says: 'He (Christ) then, although he was in the form of GOD, yet did not attempt the robbery of being *equal* with GOD. For although he recognised that he was God out of GOD the FATHER, he never compared or likened himself to GOD the FATHER, remembering that he is out of the FATHER, and that the FATHER gave him to be what he is' (xxii. p. 84). *Novatian* then believed Jesus to be *God*, but only by the *gift* and *will* of the FATHER, and was by no means *equal* with HIM.

Arnobius, A.D. 306.

He was a teacher of rhetoric, or the art of speech, at Sicca in North Africa, who wrote a *Defence of Christianity*. He believed that Jesus was *A God*, who was made so by the *will* of the FATHER. He says: 'Then at length the OMNIPOTENT and ONLY GOD *sent* Christ' (ii. p. 57). Again he says: '*Christ*, I mean *A God* speaking by the command of the SUPREME GOD' (ii. p. 50). Arnobius therefore did not believe Jesus *equal* to the FATHER.

Lactantius, A.D. 306.

He was the greatest pupil of *Arnobius*, and a master of Latin style. He also

believed Jesus to be *A God inferior* to the FATHER, as is seen from the following passage: 'He (Christ) indeed shewed his fidelity to GOD; for he taught that there is ONE GOD, and that HE ONLY is to be worshipped. Nor did he ever *say that he himself was* GOD. . . . Wherefore, because he was so faithful . . . he received the dignity of *perpetual priest*, the honour of *supreme King*, the *power of a judge*, and the *title of God*' (*Lib.* iv. 14). So *Lactantius* deemed Jesus *inferior* to the FATHER.

Eusebius, A.D. 315.

Eusebius, native and Bishop of Cæsarea, was an *Arian*, or follower of *Arius*. He wrote an excellent *Ecclesiastical History*. Like those before him, he believed Jesus to be *A God*, but not SUPREME GOD, as will be seen from the following passages. He says: 'The only begotten *Son* of GOD and *first-born* of every creature, the origin of all things, bids us deem his FATHER the ONLY TRUE GOD and worship HIM ALONE' (*Praepar.* VII. 15). Again: 'If this implants fear within them, lest somehow, we should seem to introduce *two Gods*; let them know, that though we do indeed acknowledge the *Son* to be *God*, yet there is ONE ONLY GOD, even HE WHO ALONE is WITHOUT BEGINNING, and UNBEGOTTEN, WHO has HIS DIVINITY properly from HIMSELF, and is the CAUSE even to the *Son* himself both of his *being*, and of his *being such as he is*; by WHOM the *Son* himself confesses that *he lives*; declaring expressly, "I too live through the FATHER," WHOM the *Son* himself teaches us to regard as the ONLY TRUE GOD, and confesses to be GREATER than himself, WHOM he also would have us all know to be his own GOD' (*De Eccles. Theol.* I. ii.). *Eusebius* therefore does not believe Jesus to be GOD SUPREME. He was an Arian. The belief of the Arians was this: that Jesus was a divine being, but begotten at a particular time, of *like* substance with the FATHER. The great opponent of *Arius* was *Athanasius*, who shaped the doctrine of the Trinity into its final form. A great controversy raged through the Church, which was ended for a time by the *Council of Nicæa* in Bithynia.

The Nicene Creed, A.D. 325.

At Nicæa the Bishops met, with Constantine in the chair. The Arians were outvoted, and the Nicene Creed in its simplest form was forced upon the Church. This Creed runs thus:—

'I believe in ONE GOD the FATHER ALMIGHTY, MAKER of heaven and earth; and of all things visible and invisible.

'And in one Lord Jesus Christ, the *only-begotten Son* of GOD; begotten of his FATHER before all worlds; God of GOD; Light out of LIGHT; Very God out of VERY GOD; begotten, not made; of *one substance* with the FATHER; by whom all things were made; who for us men and for our salvation, came down from heaven; and was incarnate by the Holy Spirit of the Virgin Mary; and was made man; and was crucified for us under Pontius Pilate; he suffered, and was buried, and the third day rose again, according to the Scriptures; and ascended into heaven, and sitteth at the right hand of the FATHER; and he shall come again with glory to judge the quick and the dead; whose kingdom shall have no end.

'And I believe in the *Holy Spirit*.

'And I believe in one Catholic and Apostolic Church; I acknowledge one baptism for remission of sins; and I look for the resurrection from the dead; and the life of the world to come.'

This was the original form of the Creed, as voted at *Nicæa*. To the Article on the *Holy Spirit* was added at the Council of Constantinople, A.D. 381, the phrase 'The Lord and Giver of Life, who proceedeth from the FATHER; who with the FATHER and Son together is worshipped and glorified.' To this the words 'from the FATHER and the Son' were added in the Western Church, and the Greek Church separated from the Roman. Thus the doctrine of the Trinity, which is nowhere in the Scriptures, nor in the earliest Fathers of the Church, gradually grew, until it attained its completion in the Creed wrongly attributed to *Athanasius*, but really issued about 570 A.D., two centuries later than he.

XXVIII.—Strength

F. J. GOULD

THE world all dark,—blind. The world all silent,—deaf. The world all shut up in walls so that our tongue can speak no word to it,—dumb.

Helen Keller, an American girl, was born in the year 1880. Up to the age of nineteen

months she saw the light of the sun, and the blaze of flowers, and the green of grass, and the faces of mother, father, and friends. Then she fell ill, and from that time to the present day Helen has been blind, deaf, and dumb.

Dumb? Well, no. She has had teachers who taught her to frame words that can be heard by others, though she cannot hear them herself. To-day she can read by means of the Braille letters, or raised type, which you may have seen blind folk reading from in the street. She can speak in the finger-language, and even, as I have just said, with the lips. She can write in the most lovely English, so that if ever you are able to con her 'Story of my Life' you will be charmed by the beauty of her tale. Mark Twain and other famous Americans have been proud to count Helen Keller among their friends. She is a woman who is a strong and glad power in the world. We want her to stay.

She was not always strong, but she wished for strength. Even when she was a small child she longed to be strong. She longed to count for something, so that she could make a mark, and do things that other folk felt and understood and had to reckon with.

Well, and now you shall hear how she tried to prove her strength. And mind, to begin with, *it is good to be strong*; and *it is good to desire strength.*

Miss Sullivan came to live in Mr. and Mrs. Keller's house, in order to give herself up to the work of teaching little Helen. As soon as she sat at a meal with the family, she saw Helen's way of proving her strength. Little Miss Keller grabbed at other people's food all round the table.

Miss Sullivan began the battle of Will against Will,—her will against Helen's. She pushed Helen's hand back from her plate. Helen pushed back, and made an ugly noise. The war had begun. All the family left the room, glad to let the teacher fight the thing out for herself.

Miss Sullivan locked the door, sat down, and ate her breakfast. Helen lay on the floor, kicking and screaming; also trying to pull the chair from under the teacher. After half an hour of this exercise she rose up, and felt about to see what Miss Sullivan was doing, and she thrust her hand into the teacher's plate. Being thrust back, she pinched teacher. Being pinched by teacher, she rushed round the table to find what the other folk were doing, and of course discovered that all the rest had gone out. She returned to the table, and began eating with her fingers. Miss Sullivan gave her a spoon. Helen threw it on the ground. Miss Sullivan forced Helen to the floor, and made her pick up the spoon; then put the little lady in her chair again, and compelled her to eat with the spoon. Helen finished her breakfast. Then Miss Sullivan made signs that the table-napkin was to be folded. No,—yes; no,—yes. So the tussle went on. Helen flung the serviette to the floor (the precious and useful floor!), rushed to the door, found it locked, and kicked and screamed. After a long time, she folded the napkin, and was then allowed to go out into the sunshine and the quiet garden. The battle was over, and Miss Sullivan went up to her room and cried. For not in anger or in ill-will had she struggled, and the battle had cost tears to the victor as well as the conquered.

But the child became victor also. She had thought the strong person was the person who upset neighbours, and petted neighbours, and invaded neighbours' comfort and neighbours' peace. Year by year she learned to read, to write, to do household work. Year by year she learned a yet nobler learning. She learned what strength was. She was strong in *helping herself and in helping others*; and she knew, and she knows to-day, that her strength is admired. All over the world people speak the name of Helen Keller with pleasure,—not the Helen who made the folk dread her approach, but the Helen who gives the bright example of patience, of daily work, of friendship, of cheerful speech. The noisy child was weak; the quiet woman is strong.

Once, when Miss Keller dwelt a while at the Red Farm in the country, she loved two trees. One was an oak, hundreds of years old. It stood on a cliff, and had braved the winds from whichever way they blew, and had stood unmoved amid the tempests of the centuries. She loved the strong oak that gave men shelter, and would, if needed, give them its sound and honest timber.

The other was a linden tree. It rose high beside the entrance to the Red Farm, stretching its naked boughs in winter in

friendly arches over the door, and waving its leafy curtain in summer, and flinging a happy shade. One afternoon a storm burst over the land, and, though Helen could not see the lightning, she felt the trembling of the house and the very earth. When a great shaking passed all over the building, Helen's heart beat fast with the thought,—

'The linden has fallen!'

She and her friends went out as the rain ceased, and she stretched out her hands and touched the fallen giant. To her the linden tree was like a hero that had faced a thousand dangers of wind and weather.

'It wrung my heart,' says blind Helen, in her book, 'to see him prostrate who had so mightily striven and was now mightily fallen.'

Such honour do the strong deserve. They are strong in service, giving their shelter and their shade, and preparing their sturdy wood for the use of the world. And if so be they fall, good folk rejoice not, and the hearts of men sorrow for the fall of the noble. Yes, but it is not the sorrow that is felt for the poor, weak, fretful, selfish, noisy nature that tries to be strong at the expense of other people. It is the sorrow that admires the strong even in death.

Strong tree! strong man! strong woman! we salute you in respect. Deep are your roots, and full of power your sheltering arms, and you are strong in that *strength which blesses and lives for others.*

XXIX.—Boys and Girls of the Bible

The Little Captive Maid (II Kings v. 1–19).

H. FISHER SHORT

The Books of Kings deal with the history of the Jewish nation from the death of King David to the Fall of Jerusalem, when the Kingdom of Judah came to an end. Like many other history books, as their name indicates, they tell us a great deal about kings and their battles. They also treat, however, of the religious life of the people and so give us not a little information concerning certain prophets, notably Elijah and his successor, Elisha.

In writings devoted to such purposes, we do not expect to read much about boys and girls; still, references are not wanting. For instance, we read of a boy named Manasseh who, at twelve years of age, became a king. Again, there is the story of a widow's little son who died and was raised to life again by the prophet Elijah. Then we get rather more than a reference to a little girl, and our lesson is about this little maid.

What we know about her is very little; indeed, we do not know her name. And yet, we are told just sufficient to enable us to see that she was a little girl worth knowing. She lived in what some historians would call 'troublous times.' Though only about the size of Wales, the land of Palestine when our little maid lived there, was split up into a number of little kingdoms which were constantly fighting with each other: something like the condition of Britain in the time of Alfred the Great. Among these petty kingdoms were Israel and Syria, and as they joined each other it was easy to cross the border. One day a band of Syrians made their way into Israel and, on returning to their own land, took back with them the little girl who is the subject of our lesson.

Whether she was their only captive, and why they took her, is not recorded; but she was evidently a comely child, for when we read of her, we find her in the service of the wife of the king's favourite general. Naaman, for that was the great soldier's name, was the captain of the king's host; but though a distinguished and victorious leader, he was not a happy man: he suffered from the terrible disease called leprosy. Now, strange as it may seem, though the captain was the enemy of her own people, though his soldiers had torn her away from her home, the little girl was very sorry for him and wished that he might be cured. But what could she, a little foreign slave, do?

Reading between the lines of our story we see how love found a way.

Clearly the relations between her mistress and herself were of the most cordial kind. She was apparently a sweet-natured, happy-hearted child and had captivated the affections of her mistress as securely as she herself had been taken captive by the rough Syrian soldiers. Hence, she was able to speak as freely and frankly as though she had been a daughter and not just a little slave girl. And so it fell out that one day, possibly because her little heart had been more deeply touched

by her master's unhappiness, and believing she knew how Naaman might be cured, she decided to speak. Seizing the opportunity when she and her mistress were together, she said, 'How I wish my master were with the prophet that is in Samaria! then he would be cured of his leprosy.'

The mistress may have thought the words nothing but childish chatter, for she appears to have made no reply. Some one else, however, heard the tender words and, thinking there might be something in them, went straight and told Naaman what the little maid had said.

To go into the details of what happened afterwards would divert our attention from the little girl with whom we are immediately concerned. We may note, however, that Naaman went to Elisha, the prophet in Samaria of whom she had spoken, who prescribed a certain course of treatment which had the desired effect—'his flesh came again like unto the flesh of a little child and he was clean.' It is to be hoped that Naaman rewarded his little saviour with her liberty, but of that the record conveys no hint. Perhaps she felt sufficiently rewarded when she her master return happy in his new found health and vigour.

Let us now see what lesson our little heroine has to teach us. It may be summed up in one word: namely, unselfishness.

Sooner or later, you will discover that this is the most valuable and the most difficult lesson we have to learn; and by *we*, I mean men and women as well as boys and girls. Perhaps some of you have already made the discovery; if so, you will know that hard as are spelling and arithmetic and music, they are child's play compared with learning unselfishness.

But what is unselfishness? It may be defined as that virtue, that quality of character, that spirit of life, which enables us to think of ourselves last and to make sacrifices for the sake of others. It is the very essence of Christiantiy and is what the Apostle Paul meant by charity or love. It is what a great and good man once called 'the greatest thing in the world.'

But let us see how the nameless little slave girl, who lived so long ago in far-off Palestine, teaches this great lesson.

I have just identified unselfishness with what the Apostle Paul meant by charity or love. If you will turn with me to the well-known thirteenth chapter of his First Letter to the Corinthians, you will see how close is the identification. We will take a few passages and compare them with the character and conduct of our little heroine.

I.—'Love suffereth long and is kind.' How accurately these words describe the behaviour of the little maid. Put yourself in her place. Suppose a band of foreign soldiers suddenly came into your neighbourhood and carried you away from your home and friends to be a slave in another country; you would suffer, would you not? But would you be kind? Look, now, at the little slave girl. How home-sick she must have been: how she would long to see her little playmates; how she would cry sometimes for her mother and her caresses! And yet she was kind. When she saw Naaman's unhappiness she forgot her own and did what she could to make him happy.

II.—'Love vaunteth not itself, is not puffed up.'

It is a weakness of many British people to regard themselves as belonging to the finest race on the face of the earth. Even when taken prisoner, a man of this type will sometimes express contempt for his foreign captors.

True we are a free, an enlightened, a progressive, and a powerful nation, and have good reason to be proud of our country and our people; but when we put on the airs of conceit we indulge in a form of self-love which is as silly as it is weak.

Now our little heroine belonged to a proud race. So self-important were they that they believed they were God's favourite people and that the Almighty hated all their enemies. Whether this was known to the little maid, we cannot say. I think it must have been. Whether it was or not, she did not regard herself as a superior person. When she spoke of the wonderful power possessed by the prophet of her own religion it was in no boasting spirit: her one thought was that he might cure her afflicted master.

III.—'Love doth not behave itself unseemly.'

This again seems to fit her, as the saying is, 'like a glove.' As we have just seen she was above unseemly pride, and though at times she must have been unhappy,

we may be sure she was too brave to let her mistress see her fret and weep. Had she gone about her duties looking like a picture of misery, another and a different kind of mistress would soon have been found for her. But she was unselfish, that is, she lived for the sake of others and, therefore, simply could not in any way behave unseemly in their presence.

IV.—'Love seeketh not her own, is not provoked, taketh not account of evil.'

That she would long for the freedom, the home-love and the home-land which by right were her own, we cannot doubt; but we may be equally certain that she would not be everlastingly demanding her rights. Again, we can see how easily she might have been provoked to rebel against those who had robbed her of those rights; but her tender solicitude for her suffering master proves that she did nothing of the kind. And why? Because she possessed that heroic unselfishness which enables those who have it to overcome evil with good, and even to love their enemies.

To conclude: Are you trying to learn this hard but beautiful lesson? Do you think it is worth learning? I am sure you do. I know how you appreciate kindness, and generosity, and sympathy. An act of real unselfishness fills you with admiration. You know how happy the spirit of unselfishness can make your home life—how wretched home is if you are greedy and grasping and ungenerous. Remember the world is your larger home and try, by the help that God can give, to be courageous with the courage of self-forgetting love, and manly with the manliness of our gracious master Jesus. Let the spirit of unselfish service be the law of your life. And through the gentle ministry of your daily self-sacrifice many who are afflicted with the leprosy of selfishness shall be made clean.

TEMPERANCE TEACHING

II

W. R. MARSHALL

EVERYONE knows that the fundamental problem of the Sunday school is the question of instruction. Historically, Sunday schools began by providing instruction in reading, in order that the pupils might have access to the Bible; and though it is a far cry from 1780 when Robert Raikes opened his weekly school, the tradition of Biblical instruction survives and has partly obscured the true purpose of Sunday schools. Their business is not to teach reading or literature or ethics or even rudimentary theology—but religion. The aim of the Sunday school is to impart the religious spirit, and such instruction as is given should be but the means to an end. A fact only becomes a fact when it becomes a spiritual thing, and it can only come to life in a spiritual personality; facts only become worth while when they begin to mean something. The Sunday school teacher's work is to teach the child—to teach the child through the lesson. The giving of information has its proper and necessary place, for one must distinguish between right and wrong, and form ideals of conduct; but all the energy of the moral life, all the inner impulse towards the good and from the evil must come from the mental feelings which dominate the intellect and the will and are the real source of conduct. If this be true, mental emotion holds the central place in the moral and religious life. Can it be otherwise than true? We recognise the great World-spirit not as Intellect, Wisdom, Power—but as Love,—'God is Love.' And so with man—'out of the heart are the issues of life'—the essential element of life springs from the emotions,

> 'for life,
> With all it yields of joy and woe and care and pain,
> Is just our chance o' the prize of learning love,
> How love might be, hath been indeed, and is.'

Man is an emotional animal. The work of religious education is more than anything else the culture of the emotional life. A teacher has no more important opportunity than that of teaching a child what to like and what to dislike, what to fear and what to despise, what to long for and what to strive for, and what to do,—not because it is the best policy, but because it is right. When he has done this, he may well feel satisfied.

This can seldom be accomplished by those who believe virtue is to be attained through knowledge. Education may begin with the training of the physical and intellectual powers, but it must not stop there. Moral culture must be added—instruction in obedience, temperance, truthfulness,

honour,—and these, acting in and upon the religious atmosphere of the home and the school, make a further contribution to the scheme of training; and the child becomes a well educated man. Even then the scheme of conduct lacks the essential counterpart—the religious principle. Knowledge, moral training, religion—these are the driving forces that make for conduct and character. And the greatest of these is religion.

Moral training is so permeated with precepts and instruction which have their bases in religious thought and principle that it has been blended with religion; there is a wide distinction between them, however; but because they intermingle, good results are obtained from moral training. Perfect development can only come through religion. 'Religion transforms the conscience, makes man reverent, fills him with humility, bends his will into obedience to the divine law, inspires him to duty, bridles his passions, and stimulates his altruistic virtues.' It establishes that communion of the individual, not merely with the members of his own family, but with the Father of all. God is spirit; we are spirit; religion unites our spirit with the divine.

If, therefore, there is any lesson which will make for pure conduct and clean character, we must enlist the help of religion on its behalf. We must not be content with a scientific exposition, an elaborate argument; we must translate the fact into the terms of emotion; we must transmute the argument into an appeal; we must make the lesson *live*—by the aid of religion. That cannot be done in an ordinary—public elementary or secondary—state-aided school. The teacher there, though he teach faithfully 'the principles of the Christian religion and morality,' though he seize every possible opportunity for incidental lessons on thrift or temperance, will always fall short of the success possible to his colleague, the Sunday school teacher.

Here is the lesson on 'Temperance,' recognised by the Government as necessary in all national schools. 'If only we were not so desperately familiar with it all, the physical, moral, and spiritual squalor springing from drink would haunt our imagination at every turn and pierce our conscience through.' When the revered Mr. Armstrong penned that note of despair, the Education Department was not so alive to the remedy as its administrators are to-day. Now at least three lessons a year *may* be taught in schools,—the option being left with the local Education authority, or, as is the case in London, with the local boards of managers.

Meanwhile, what of the Sunday schools? They need not wait for a government departmental circular, an outline scheme or a syllabus of lessons. They are not dependent on the good opinion of inspectors for a 'grant.' In most cases, the individual Sunday school teacher has perfect liberty of choice; his plan of lessons is not always mapped out for him by the committee or superintendent; he may teach what he thinks will be of the best value to his young friends, his pupils. The international lessons, used in orthodox Sunday schools, embody a quarterly temperance lesson, and in most cases that is based on a Bible passage.

It is the most vital lesson given during the term—to save the children from the greatest curse that can come into their lives. Not only preachers but judges, economists, and especially doctors, have sternly said so. And this curse is lowering the manhood of the people, and, despite all our boasted commerce, is reducing us to national decay. Britain tends to become a byword among the nations because of this thing.

> 'This heavy-headed revel east and west,
> Makes us traduced and taxed of other nations,
> They clepe us drunkards.'

From this curse everyone wishes to save the children. The legislator will formulate wise deterrent laws, and the social reformer will see that such are faithfully carried out. The day school teacher will follow his instructions—he will perform experiments showing the nature of alcohol, revealing its presence in certain beverages, and its physical effects on man; he may even tell of its effects on the intelligence and understanding of the individual, and of the social evils which result from alcoholic excess. The Band of Hope lecturer will expound the lesson in many ways—with apparatus, sketch, and illustrative anecdote. And none of them can hope for success—legislator, social worker, teacher or lecturer—unless the lesson touch the religious

instinct of the child. All the prohibitive legislation in the world; all the teaching and lecturing against alcohol provide no safeguard for the individual when the day comes. It is comparatively easy to legislate; it is not difficult to lecture; it *is* difficult, very difficult so to teach the child that he may himself build walls of resistance that shall withstand temptation's attack. The physical wall of resistance may be raised in the home; everyone knows that a sound physical constitution is the outcome of good habits rather than intellectual convictions, and it cannot be expected that mere teaching in temperance will be an adequate substitute for the training from infancy upwards which is found in every good home. The intellectual wall has its foundation deeper down—with that faculty which teaches the priceless value of the soul, which makes me glad,—

> 'That no thing I know,
> Feel, or conceive, but I can make my own
> Somehow, by use of hand or head or heart.'

Building that wall is an entirely different matter. It may be that all mental powers are the outcome of habits of will and conduct persistently taught over many years, and that therefore a carefully thought-out system of moral training might in the end produce a type proof against all shocks of temptation.

Herein lies the work of the Sunday school teacher. To him the nation looks for its citizens 'firm to resist' every form of evil—gambling, intemperance, sensuality. His success is tested not by what the pupils know, but by what they become. And that will largely depend upon their power to resist the allurements of alcoholic liquors. Enlightened by sound scientific knowledge and uplifted by religious conviction, they may effectively labour for the coming of the kingdom of God,—in the heart as in the world.

A Temperance Lesson for the Sunday School.

(Based on Sect. III. Govt. Syll., pp. 7 and 18, for children of 12 years and upwards.)

Reading: Daniel vi. 1–27. (The story is a parable; the lion symbolises danger. Daniel had prepared himself by his temperate life to endure, and his coming unhurt out of the danger made Nebuchadnezzar honour Yahveh.)

I.—*The habitual drinker loses power of self-control.*

a. He may never get drunk, but his feelings grow less keen; he becomes slightly deaf, cannot see quite distinctly, and other bodily senses are dulled; he becomes 'maudlin'; mental sensations—love, fear—are less felt.

b. The continued drinking habit renders more permanent this dulness of sensation.

c. Habit is acquired by frequent repetition of an act; he becomes intemperate.

II.—*Temperance, Self-control are needed to keep us from—*

a. Bad temper, greediness, laziness, extravagance, selfishness, unkindness, as well as from alcoholic excess. Intemperance in one way leads to intemperance in others; weakness in one respect means weakness in another.

b. Youth is the time to learn; easy to control temper over little things; 'he that is faithful in that which is little is faithful also in much'; easy to train young plant by pruning and fixing; almost impossible to train full grown tree; cf. soft potter's clay and the finished article.

c. Difficult to get rid of bad habits in mature life; easier to form a habit than to break down an old one; men frequently drink more than is good for them not because they are thirsty but because they lack the moral courage to refuse.

III.—*The Ideal Man.*

A well-balanced and high moral character; one of the aims of education,—to see life clearly and see it whole. Virtuous habits are correlated. To cultivate one virtue unduly may lead to neglect of others equally desirable:

> 'O wad some power the giftie gie us
> To see oursels as ithers see us.'

The abstainer may be greedy, untruthful, mean, cruel or unjust, just as a drunkard may be charitable and generous.

The practice of temperance is a means to an end. The highest aim of man consists in taking a share in the work by which God is perfecting the universe.

OLD WILLIAM

R. STUART REDFERN

Sacred to the Memory
of
WILLIAM HODGIN
Who died August 17th, 1889
Aged 73.
For 40 years the Bellringer at this Chapel.

Such is the record on a plain stone slab standing in the graveyard of one of our little chapels that nestle among the hills and valleys of Rockshire. Far away from the crowded streets; away from the bustle and turmoil of the city, at the entrance of a tiny village, inhabited by miners and farmers, isolated from the rest of the world, and at that time away from the beaten track of the tourist; where it would seem to an outsider that life would almost be a burden, because of its dull, uninteresting monotony; there 'Old William,' or 'Old Hodgin' as we used to call him, lived and died, and there he was buried. There Sunday after Sunday for forty years of his life he called the villagers to worship.

I have read the inscription recorded above hundreds of times, and I have thought of the words of the great King of the Jews, who is said to have left it on record 'That he would rather be a door-keeper in the house of his God, than to dwell in the tents of wickedness'; and I have wondered if it were a less honourable thing for Old William to have been the *Bellringer* in the house of *his* God for forty years? As I have read this curious record, my mind has wandered to the grand and richly carved tombs in St. Paul's Cathedral or Westminster Abbey, on which are engraved in letters of gold the noble deeds of the great ones whose remains are resting there; and I have wondered whether it may not be that in the sight of him 'unto whom all hearts be open, all desires known,' the deeds of this poor and unlettered miner, who for two score years called his neighbours week by week to come and refresh their world-weary souls, or seek support and consolation in their sorrow by communion with their Father in heaven, are as acceptable and as noble a service as those on the field of battle deemed worthy of a page in history, or of being recorded in letters of gold on marble domes? It may be that the one long sustained act of loyalty of that simple-hearted villager, humble and commonplace though it seems, will one day have as honoured a place as that which men regard as fit to be inscribed on the scroll of fame.

'Old William,' or 'Old Hodgin,' was a familiar figure in our village life. Old age and frequent accidents had rendered him unfit for regular employment; he was very poor, and lived in a tiny house that could be more correctly described as a cabin than a cottage. His limbs were stiff and lame, his hands were knotted and drawn out of shape by hard rough toil and rheumatism; his body had been crushed and mangled in the mine, so that he could no longer go down into the bowels of the earth, and so he eked out a poor existence by repairing the stone fences in the farmers' fields. But in spite of his humble condition of life, we always treated him with great respect; the young and mischievous never played their tricks or practised their jokes on him; we never took liberties even with his name—we never called him 'Bill,' for instance, it was always 'William Hodgin,' 'Old William,' or 'Old Hodgin.' But that was not because he put on airs; he was a perfect type of the old countryman, a type that is fast disappearing in these days; there was nothing of the upstart or make-believe about William, and he was always cheerful and pleasant. On the Sunday he never missed attending the services at the chapel, even when his bell-ringing days were ended. So long as he could walk, he would be there before time, clad in black cloth that had gone green and grey with age and long use, and a top hat that was of ancient make and shape. He came regularly to join in the common worship, even though he was too deaf to hear a word the minister had to say. One Sunday an incident happened which would have completely upset the gravity of a town congregation and probably have made serious worship impossible for the rest of the service. But it was 'Old William' whose deafness had caused the mistake, and so there passed over the faces of the congregation only a faint smile of pity rather than of amusement. It happened in this way. The minister, in announcing the hymn, had stated that one verse would be omitted;

'Old William' did not hear this, and so he sang the hymn through, and the result was that when the rest of the congregation had finished, 'Old William' had one verse still to sing. He always joined heartily in the singing, and so without noticing that the others had sat down, and being too deaf to hear that their voices had ceased, he kept on singing, and sang the whole verse through as a solo, the harmoniumist very considerately playing on to the end. Years afterwards we often smiled and referred good-naturedly to 'Old William's' solo, but when the incident occurred it barely disturbed the ordinary quietude of the service.

But the time came when the familiar form of 'Old William' was missed by the little band of worshippers. As we sang together the quaint old tunes, we no longer heard his pathetic, faltering voice; he was ill and poor, old, infirm, and alone. Yet he never lacked anything, except the companionship and loving service of wife or daughter; but one was dead, and the other far away, and so kind and sympathetic friends and neighbours rendered him such service as they were able. When we called at his tiny, comfortless home to ask him how he did, he would smile cheerfully, stir up his bit of fire, bustle about and set us a chair, and always cheerily give us the same answer—'Aw'm better t'dee, aw've had a very bad neet, but aw'm better t'dee.' We loved him all the more for his cheerful answer, even though we knew the sad and lonely hours he had spent in coughing and struggling for breath through the night; yet he never complained, but said 'Aw'm better t'dee.'

He had one great fear that overshadowed his latter days; he dreaded lest the fact that he was ill and lonely should necessitate his removal to the 'House.' His great longing was that he might be permitted to die among his friends and laid to rest near the little church he had served so long and faithfully. We promised we would do our best to keep him with us till the end, and were able to make arrangements for him to have the attendance that was considered necessary, while the neighbours supplied him with food. But although he was invariably 'better t'dee,' he gradually grew weaker, and the burden of affliction became daily more heavy. On a Sunday evening, just as we were closing the service, a message was handed to the minister 'that "Old William" was dying.' He left the pulpit, hurried across the fields, and was just in time to see the good old Bellringer pass onward, and thank God for having taken to himself his afflicted child, and that the weak and lonely old man had left the home of poverty and want for the home of his Father.

Thus ended the earthly career of a humble and obscure working miner, the greatest record of whose life was one of loyalty and devotion to the work of a little country chapel in the humble capacity of bellringer for forty years; ended in poverty, in a home destitute of comforts, with no child to close his eyes in the last long sleep. We carried him to his resting place, near to the bell which for so many years had responded to his efforts. A long and picturesque procession of neighbours followed his remains to their last resting place; not clad in mourning attire, but in homely tweed and corduroys, such as the farmer wears at markets and fairs. But they had come from all the surrounding villages to pay a last tribute of respect to one whom they had learned to honour.

More than twenty years have passed since we missed from among us the contented cheery face and the limping gait of 'Old William,' and during that time many changes have taken place in our village life. The people from the large cities and busy towns have discovered our quiet retreat, and now every year they come in crowds to rest after the exhausting labours in factory or in office, and many an afflicted one has found renewed strength and a more vigorous life in the restful peace and the bracing mountain air of this part of Rockshire. The seclusion and isolation which some of us loved so dearly are gone for ever, and strangers come to the service at our little chapel. Some stop at 'Old William's' grave, read the inscription, and then turn away with a half-pitying smile, which plainly says—'How simple these country folks are, and what a great deal they make out of nothing.' But those who knew and honoured the old man, who loved his cheery voice, and regarded his mangled and distorted limbs as the scars of a brave veteran of the army of industry, still read the legend over his grave with undiminished interest. We

revere the name of William Hodgin, and honour the man for his forty years' services as bellringer at our chapel. It is a sacred memory to us, and should be an inspiration for more faithful service to all.

GUARDIANS OF THE POOR

ALICE EDWARDS

A LARGE schoolroom, adorned with the usual texts and pictures, 'Jesus blessing the children,' 'The Good Samaritan,' 'Do unto others as ye would they should do unto you,' 'Give unto him that asketh of thee'; the benches crowded not with children alone but with the miscellaneous assortment of old and young, married, deserted, single and orphans, known as a revision crowd.

The cumbrous machinery of the Poor Law, moving heavily in the well-worn ruts, demands that from time to time the guardians shall see with their eyes every man, woman, and child capable of movement who is in receipt of relief; and here they are in the Wesleyan schoolroom, lent for the occasion. For four hours now, the weary wait has lasted; the children are getting noisy, the women hot and flustered, and the old folks pining for a cup of tea. 'Lucky for them whose names begins with a "hay"' says a portly mother of seven who has the misfortune to be a Wheeler; 'Set still, will you?' with a vicious poke at Jimmy, aged five, who has exhausted every device known to him to pass the time, even to pinning his mother's bonnet strings to Mrs. Smith's, when the two were in the most thrilling part of their *tête-à-tête*. 'But there, some folks has no chanst. Now look at 'er,' pointing to a pale, spare woman, with a sturdy boy and a small girl of six, who sat nervously clutching the boy's hand, and starting whenever the door opened and a new name was called. 'Five years since she lost 'er 'usband, and five shillings a week ever since; and they gives me seven and six with my seven, and me as never put my 'and to nothing whilst George lived. I call it a sin and a shame,' with a withering glance at the pale woman, who seemed, however, not to hear.

'You 'adn't ought to say such things, Missis,' interposed a bony old man, doubled up with rheumatism, turning a severe look on the portly dame. ''Er mother died in the 'sylum, and she's that nervous she drops things all over the place, if she tries to do charing, and sets and cries if they say ought to her. Now your Jem and Bill are both in places, and arning good wages, so they ought to 'elp you; and I don't know as you oughter 'ave anythink if all is true as I 'ear.'

'Silence there, please,' cries the perspiring and distracted relieving officer, as he gathers some more Smiths and Sawyers and puts them near the door. 'No, Mrs. Smith, not you—I told you the ones with children first'—and armed with notebook he ushers Mrs. Thomas Smith and her five children into the next room, where, seated on each side of a long baize covered table, sit the guardians, those belonging to the parish now under revision being next the chairman.

Honestly anxious to do their best for the poor, yet conscious that the ratepayers look with ever increasing suspicion on the fast mounting poor rate, they are always trying to hit the happy mean between parsimony and extravagance, and generally succeeding in pleasing neither the persons relieved nor the unwilling givers.

'Now, Mrs. Smith, are you come to tell us you can do without us?' says the chairman, and Mrs. Smith smiles faintly in response to the well-worn joke. 'Any change?' Ellen is fourteen now and has a little place, two shillings a week and her food. Rob is in the fifth standard, and will soon be able to go on a milk round or sell papers before school time, and help his mother pay for the boots which are always wearing out. They quite understand the situation and follow the questions and answers with eager interest. The two next stand with large round eyes fixed on the chairman, feeling that in some way this kindly white-haired gentleman holds the fate of the family in his hands. Only the baby crows and chirps in his mother's arms, quite unmoved by the general excitement, and pokes his chubby fingers in her mouth, as she tries to keep him quiet.

'Well, Mrs. Smith, you are doing your best, but we shall have to reduce it next time.' And with a gasp of relief, she clutches the baby and finds her way into the open air.

A buzz of talk greets the next comer, a short square man, with a low forehead and small shifty eyes. Three months before, the man, whose wife had just died, leaving him with a small baby, the tenth, had so worked on the feelings of the guardians that they had taken six of the children on his promising to bring the most of his wages as a contribution towards their support. Naturally he had failed to do this, and he was now to be told to take them out. 'And where am I to take the pore things to, gentlemen?' says the short man. 'I 'aven't got no 'ome, and who would take me in with that family?' 'He has no business to have so many if he can't support them,' observes a lady guardian severely; but her remark finds no support from the company, who look with disfavour on Malthusian ideas, and think the lady a dangerous socialist whose principles if carried out might lead to revolutions and the general upsetting of the Empire. The square man sees his advantage and pushes it with the cunning born of long practice.

'Keep the biby, sir,' he says, rubbing an imaginary tear out of the corner of his eye with a very dirty red handkerchief. 'She ain't got no mother to look after her.' The relieving officer here suggests in a stage whisper to the chairman that as the mother died from the effects of a drunken brawl, the 'biby' has not lost much by being deprived of her attentions.

'Haven't you an older daughter who could look after the children?' asks the chairman, with an air of having solved the difficulty; but a further whisper, announcing that the eldest girl of eighteen is now in the maternity ward of the workhouse settles that question, so the chairman steels himself to say finally with great decision, 'We can do no more for you; you must take them out to-morrow.' The best thing that can happen is for them to fall into the hands of the 'children's man,' and the relieving officer is warned to give him a hint as to their whereabouts.

And so across the bare stage there flit, in quick succession, the various types of most of the ills which flesh is heir to,—the victims of hereditary disease, scrofulous, phthisical, epileptic, ricketty, feeble-minded; paupers, and children of paupers,—all with the indelible brand of the unfit, poor parasites on the social body, kept alive by the humanitarians of the age, but for ever doomed to take the lowest place; and equally pathetic, the long procession of the old,—men and women who in their declining years have to depend on the scanty pittance of out-relief to keep body and soul together or to persuade some hard pressed son or daughter to give them a home.

As the last tottering footstep passes down the room, the clerk closes his big book with a yawn, the guardians make off to tea, the caretaker with a sigh thinks of the cleaning up there will have to be to-morrow, and a ray of sunlight illuming the dusky room falls on the text which surmounts the chimney piece. 'Come unto me,' it says, 'all ye that are weary and heavy laden, and I will give you rest.'

RELIGIOUS TRAINING IN AUSTRALASIA

WM. TUDOR JONES, Ph.D.

On behalf of the British and Foreign Unitarian Association I have had the great privilege of visiting all the churches and Sunday schools of Australasia. I shall try to present to the readers of the Quarterly some aspects of the good work carried on in these far-away lands. Starting with New Zealand, our journey must begin in Auckland, where a Unitarian church and school have now been in existence for ten years, under the able guidance of the Rev. W. Jellie, B.A. Three years ago I had the pleasure of preaching in Auckland for three Sundays and of addressing the scholars of the Sunday school there. It is a school of which any church might be proud. The children have long distances to travel. Some of them come with their parents to the morning service, and remain in the church during the whole of the day, preparations having been made by which they get their meals there. They are divided into classes, and the work proceeds on lines similar to those of an efficient Sunday school in this country. It is an interesting sight to see them, beautifully clad in white garments, with sandals only, and a large number of the boys without any head-gear when out of the school. The climate of Auckland is semi-tropical in summer, and consequently

there have been brought about great alterations in the colour and development of the children of British people. On account of the more favourable climate of Australasia the children appear healthier and brighter than the children of this country. They live nearly all the year round in the open air, and many of them during the summer months sleep out of doors. The Auckland Church has made and is making a great attempt to prevent the leakage which usually takes place between the Sunday school and the church. Mr. Tom Macky has for many years conducted a class of grown-up boys, and paid a great deal of attention to them outside the school. Meetings are arranged for them in the week; a gymnasium and clubs have been in existence for several years, and the result is that many of the boys of the past are now faithful young men in connection with all the activities of the church. The Auckland friends are attacking in an interesting manner this great problem of leakage to be found all over the world, and it is my firm impression that they are succeeding in a satisfactory degree. It may be said that the future of their church is safe because their Sunday school is so full of varied activity.

The other church, in the capital of New Zealand—Wellington—was ministered to by myself during the past four years. It must be remembered that there was no church or school there when I arrived in April, 1906. A few friends were meeting occasionally for a Sunday evening lecture. For the first three years we met in the large Masonic Hall, and in April, 1909, we entered our own beautiful church and schoolroom. Before entering our new building I made the experiment of taking all the children and young people together on Sunday morning at 10 o'clock, and holding an hour's service before the ordinary morning service. The venture proved a greater success than I had anticipated. The ages ranged from five to twenty, but during the whole of this period the elder boys and girls continued to be interested in it. Courses were given on the 'Heroes of the Bible,' 'The Teaching of Jesus,' 'The Way to become Good and Great,' 'The Great Unitarian Leaders of the World.' The smaller children between seven and twelve were asked to write an account of the lesson and read it on the platform before the school the next Sunday morning. This was found extremely interesting, and a large number of children responded to the appeal. Others were asked to recite a Psalm or to give out the hymns in the services. The whole responsibility for arranging the meeting was given to the elder boys. They also took the collection in turns, arranged books, seats, and pulpit. They never failed to get all things in order by the time of my arrival at 10 o'clock. When we had completed our new church we found ourselves obliged to do without a caretaker on account of our heavy expenses. The work of opening the church and making all the arrangements was left to the children, and here again I must say that the boys did it admirably until the very last Sunday I was amongst them, and I know they will continue to do it in the future. I noticed remarkable changes in the thoughts of these growing, bright children. I long now when I write these lines to have a glimpse at their beautiful faces. They will be dear to me all the days of my life. They will be a credit to any church in the future. Many of them (boys and girls) will in the future occupy some of the most prominent positions in their own country, and will be faithful to the church where they had their first public religious training. Before I left I divided the school into classes, and was fortunate in having a woman of such influence as Miss Mary E. Richmond to become superintendent, whilst her sister, Mrs. Fell, a former student of Newnham College, Cambridge, assisted. The other teachers have been educated in the New Zealand University. The future of this dear school in Wellington is in safe hands.

With many regrets we left New Zealand on the 25th of February, and, crossing the great Tasman Sea, spent ten days in Sydney. The Rev. George Walters has laboured here with marked success for over twenty years. Most of the Sunday school work in Sydney is done in the week-time. Sydney is an Australian Venice, and transit is largely by boats. It is easier to get the young people together in the week. The lectures and classes arranged for the young here are well known all over Australia. Mr. Walters has a number of very able people to help him in the good work. The large church was

crowded during all the services and lectures I conducted there.

Another ten days was spent in Melbourne —like Sydney another wonderful city. The Rev. F. Sinclaire, M.A., has laboured here under very great difficulties, but he is brave, optimistic, and able, and so has surmounted many of the obstacles. He is making his influence felt in the city, and he has already gathered around himself a large class of young people on Sunday afternoons to study the Bible and also social problems. This class will form a centre of activity for the church. I met a number of young men he had drawn together, and I was much impressed by their ability and character.

Another week was spent in Adelaide—the city of summer flowers. The Rev. Wilford Harris, M.A., has laboured here for two years. Mr. Harris's name and character are well known. Wherever he is, a good and lasting influence is exerted. To know him is to love him, and he is loved by all his people and their children. Here in Adelaide a remarkable Unitarian congregation is to be found. I counted about a dozen carriages by the large stables at the close of the morning service. The city is very scattered, and walking for many is out of the question. This difficulty of distance must affect the Adelaide school as the city increases.

It has been a profitable experience for me to witness the good and great work done in the far-away islands of the Southern Seas on behalf of Unitarian Christianity and the training of the young ; and it is a great happiness to look back and feel that I have been privileged to give a helping hand on ' the other side of the world ' to a religious movement which is destined to cover the earth as the waters cover the face of the sea.

The Bishop of Hull, preaching recently from the words ' I am come that they might have life,' said Sunday school teaching ought not to fall behind the skilled teaching in the day school. He urged teachers to join preparation classes, to seize every opportunity of learning the art of teaching, and to become familiar with their subjects. Often too much was attempted in Sunday schools, hence the necessity of concentrating on those things that would help forward the Christian life of the children. ' I am come that they may have life ' should be the teacher's motive.

THE SUNDAY SCHOOL ASSOCIATION

ION PRITCHARD

The meetings in August last at Berlin and Cologne of representatives of Liberal Churches and Thought, a World's Congress as it was fittingly called, form one of the most important, if not the most important, recent events connected with the Unitarian movement. Sixteen nationalities were represented, and more than one hundred English members attended, two hundred came from America, and the number present at one or other of the many meetings is said to have exceeded four thousand. A wonderful series of receptions, conferences, excursions, dinners, and speeches, interspersed with long stretches of railway travel, the experiences of which will be long remembered by those who took part !

Here is an outline of the proceedings :—

Cologne on the Rhine.—A welcome committee awaited the arrival of the visitors at the railway station, and invited them, after a short interval for rest, to a formal dinner. Many addresses expressing the heartiest hospitality were delivered by the entertainers and acknowledged by the guests. An hour's interval and then the large party was invited to the ' Flora,' a sort of small Crystal Palace, to be again generously entertained until nearly midnight. The next day a steamboat journey up the Rhine was arranged to Remagen, close to the famous Apollinaris Springs. In a large dining hall overlooking the river another grand dinner was served, at which the hosts and their guests from many lands expressed their welcome and acknowledgments in words of friendship and good-will. Then came the pleasant journey back, the river scenery looking its best in the evening light. Our Cologne experience was a happy one.

Berlin.—A five days' crowded programme, commencing at 8-30 a.m. on Saturday with a lecture by Professor Harnack, closing on the following Wednesday with a short impressive address by Père Hyacinthe Loyson and a final banquet. So numerous were the subjects to be discussed and the speakers to discuss them that on three occasions simultaneous meetings had to be arranged in different halls. The speakers' names and their

titles alone would fill a column of the QUARTERLY.

The chief subjects considered and spoken to by various speakers were three in number :—

1. The world's debt to Germany for its lead in advanced religious thought and study.

2. German Theology and the German Church.

3. The sympathetic relations that should exist between all religious denominations and their forward movements.

The German theologians and professors had of course the lion's share of the talk, but there were many English names on the list.

To enable the members to withstand the mental strain of the conferences there were short intervals in the day when the programme suggested that the sights of the town might be visited. An excursion to Potsdam, a steamboat trip on the Wanne See, and a church concert were also thoughtfully provided as necessary recreation.

WITTENBERG.—The scene of most of Martin Luther's labours. Here the college home of the Reformer was visited ; the town church where he so often preached ; the church (now practically rebuilt) where the remains of both Luther and Melancthon are laid, and on the gates of which, in metal letters, are the various clauses of Luther's protest against the papal claims ; and lastly, the spot whereon the excommunication bull was burnt. Two hours stay, then on again.

WEIMAR, famous as the home of Goethe and Schiller ; sacred to pilgrims as Stratford-on-Avon is to us. The houses were visited, and at an evening meeting addresses were given telling of the worth and special significance of the teaching of the two revered leaders. Professor Eucken also came to the meeting and added to its interest by giving a short lecture on Freedom in Religious Thought.

My companions and I shall not forget the restful quiet and peace of the garden-house where we spent the night after this long eventful day.

EISENACH AND THE WARTBURG.—Here in the old castle precincts a farewell dinner was arranged, and speeches of goodwill and welcome made. The kind hospitality was acknowledged in German in a happily expressed speech by the Rev. H. Enfield Dowson, highly appreciated by our German hosts. Then the large party was shown over the building made memorable by the long compulsory stay of Luther after his interview with the Emperor Charles V. at Worms. The Congress was over.

And the Sunday School Association—what part did it play at the Congress ? Not a very active one, although it was well represented by its President, the Editor of ' Young Days ' and member of committee, and the Hon. Secretary. There was no part in the programme set apart for the consideration of the religious training of young people or Sunday school work—surely, as many of us think, a lost opportunity. At the next Congress, which is to be held in Paris, it is to be hoped that this important subject will have a place in the proceedings. All that could be done was to send copies of the Association's publications to the hall of assembly for exhibition, to take care that a table was set apart for them, and that the books were suitably displayed,—and this was done.

All congress members will I am sure be glad to bear testimony to the exceedingly kind welcome shown them everywhere by our German friends ; indeed, the feast of good things provided erred only perhaps on the side of profusion.

BY THE WAY

LOUISA MAY ALCOTT, by Belle Moses (Sampson, Low & Co., 6/- net). We opened this book with pleasure, and enjoyed every chapter in it. We had wondered whether our favourite passages from the ' Life ' would be included, and rejoiced to find them—especially that one about the Sunday evenings at Theodore Parker's home. If the author begins a little too soon to speak in high praise of her heroine we can forgive her, for she writes as one who has undertaken a labour of love. Was there ever such a family as ' the Alcotts who couldn't make money ' ? And was there ever just such a brave, loyal and loving heart as Louisa ? We welcome this story of a strenuous life, and are glad to think that while her stories maintain their charm something more has been done to keep fresh and real the life of one of the best of women. We congratulate Belle Moses on the success of her work—it is as fascinating as ' Little Women ' itself.

* * *

THE INSTITUTE FOR RELIGIOUS EDUCATION held at Meadville, Pennsylvania, U.S., for two weeks, June 26th—July 11th, was one evidence of the

general effort to make religious education more effective, especially in the Sunday school and the home. Meadville is the seat of the Unitarian Theological School, and it was due to this fact that this Summer School could offer such attractive features. The Meadville Conference, composed of the Unitarian Churches of the region, stood back of the Institute, and the Unitarian Sunday School Society co-operated here as it did in the Institute held at the Isle of Shoals for one week a little later. The Theological School offered the rooms of Divinity Hall, and also the lecture rooms, gymnasium, and boarding hall; so the expenses were moderate.

Unitarian churches are not numerous in this region, but representatives came in sufficient numbers to satisfy and more those who had charge of the arrangements. It is expected that not only will those be benefited who were present, but that they will take back to the churches some of the information and enthusiasm which they received.

A service was held in chapel every morning at 8-45. At nine o'clock daily Dr. F. C. Doan, of the Theological School, lectured on 'The Religion of Childhood.' The subject was treated from the psychological standpoint, and there were many points of application to Sunday school and home. At 10-15 Dr. F. A. Christie, of the School, lectured on 'The Jesus of History.' He treated the subject in such a simple way and with such charm that all were eager listeners to his discussion of the gospel literature. At 11-30 Miss Sara C. Bullard, a successful teacher in the public kindergartens of Boston and also in the Sunday school kindergarten, lectured on the work for the youngest children, giving definitely the material in the form of story, song, etc., which she had collected for her own use.

The afternoons were generally left free for recreation. On two afternoons, however, Miss Bullard conducted a practice class. And in the morning hour usually taken by her on those days there were conferences on Sunday school methods, led by Rev. Wm. I. Lawrance, the new President of the Sunday School Society.

Three popular evening lectures were given: one by Rev. Leon A. Harvey, of Brooklyn, on 'Tennyson as an Interpreter of Life'; one by Rev. J. H. Applebee on 'My Friends the Honey Bees'; and one by Rev. L. W. Mason, D.D., of Pittsburg, on 'The Part of the Backwoodsman in the Making of America.' The other evenings were occupied by some readings from the prophets of the Old Testament by Mr. Lawrance, by conferences, and by socials. The Institute was opened and closed with remarks by President Southworth of the Theological School, who served as President of the Institute.

It is expected that the Institute will be held again next summer, to begin on the day following the fourth Sunday in June.—*Henry T. Secrist.*

* * *

An Adult School is now a popular auxiliary to Free Churches throughout the country. About seventeen hundred are in existence. Most belong to Unions which are in their turn controlled by the National Council of Adult Schools, which by literature, and a system of visitation, animates and guides the movement generally.

The schools are officially unsectarian, and notwithstanding the varied buildings in which they are held, and the temptations which such conditions present to the leaders to turn the atmosphere into the distilled dew of the particular doctrine usually taught, the Union's rule is generally rigidly observed.

The average procedure is as follows: Hymn, Half-hour Lecturette, Discussion, Hymn, Prayer, Opening of Bible subject, Conversation, Notices, Reports, Hymn, Prayer. Some schools break up into classes for Bible study, but come together for Notices and final Prayer. A very few schools, realising that two subjects in two hours would prevent an assimilation of either, only have one, a lecturette, and arrange for a Bible reading, with some bearing on the matter introduced, to be given. Each is then discussed in the light of the other. As the Union has no hard and fast rule as to order of meeting such schools are not interfered with; most, however, proceed on the old lines.

It will be seen what a valuable asset to religious progress the Adult School movement is. Professedly a meeting for the full and free discussion of spiritual and social matters, such gatherings are bound to broaden the minds of those who take part and tend to discover truth for those who otherwise would never find it.

True, the Union at present seems to lay more stress on a reverent, than an intelligent, study of the Bible; insists on conversion as a solution of some character problems, perhaps rather unwarrantably; but an Adult School is a splendid field for the earnest sower of the seed.

* * *

Is Your School really a School? Is it properly equipped? Have you a class-room for every class? Have you a sufficient supply of suitable text-books? Are there Bibles enough and New Testaments enough for every scholar to have one to himself? What are you trying to do? What is your aim? Have you a preparation class—if not, why not? Is your work planned, or haphazard, disconnected, characterless?

* * *

The Summary of Statistics of our Unitarian Schools may be of use at the beginning of another winter's work. There are 290 of them (including Capetown but excluding those in Australasia), with 3,552 teachers. Of 34,578 scholars on the books nearly a third are over sixteen years of age—10,651 to be exact.

* * *

Rebuilding.—The sixty-five annual reports of the Manchester District Sunday School Association testify to remarkable activity in the rebuilding of schools and the provision of adequate accommodation. It is surprising how very many of the associated schools have either rebuilt or otherwise largely extended their premises. Now there is a wonderful equipment of class-rooms in nearly every Unitarian School. Where conditions will allow we may shortly hear of the erection of gymnasia; then when every available inch of space is occupied and the schools are in one way or another in use every night in the week, we may hear of branch Sunday schools being opened. Considering the wonderful growth of towns in the last fifty years the time has come when plans for decentralising our work must be considered.